http://web.archive.org/web/20030707180913/http://web.newsguy.com/sunaina/cj26.htm

http://web.newsguy.com/sunaina/cj01.htm

BOOK INDEX

CONTENT

TO THE LORD CHANCELLOR

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES.

By

Dr. Akena Adoko

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr Akena Adoko is a Papal Knight of Saint Gregory the Great. He was President of the Uganda Law Society. He is an American educated Social-Anthropologist with a Master and Doctorate degrees in comparative law. He is also an English trained Barrister but has voluntarily opted to have himself disbarred in order to expose corruption within the public service. Ten years ago, he wrote a book on the Jeffrey Archer Scandal. It exposed mercilessly the charges for which Lord Archer has now been prosecuted.

The first edition of his book, are sold out.

Dr Adoko has brought several cases of corruption against public offices such as Lord Chancellor, the Law Society and the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal. They are due for a public hearing within the year. Dr Adoko hereby makes available his book "The Most Corrupt British Judges", published over two years ago, all hard copies of the book copies having been completely sold out, for the benefit of the public, over the internet.

JUDICIAL CORRUPTION: THE START.

Chapter 1. Millennium Present:

THE MOST CORRUPT LAWYERS:

Chapter 2. (Chronology of Events of Racial Discrimination):

Chapter 3. The Gang of Four: Rendall, Saunders, Hone & Coles:

Chapter 4. Individuals Members of the Gang:

Chapter 5. The Cross Examination of Mrs. Coles:

Chapter 6. Lord Anthony Lester of Herne Q.C.:

Chapter 7. Solicitor Robin Lewis:

THE MOST CORRUPT JUDGES:

Chapter 8. Chairman: Ms. E R Donnelly:

Chapter 9. (Chronology of Events of- Publishing Proof of Offences):

Chapter 10. Chairman David Booth:

Chapter 11. Mr. Justice Morrison:

Chapter 12. Anonymous Judges:

Chapter 13. Mr. Justice Michael Wright:

Chapter 14. His Honour Judge Mitchel:

Chapter 15. Mr. Justice Potts:

Chapter 16. The Legal Aid Board Mr. Justice Maurice Kay:

Chapter 17. Office for the Supervision of Solicitors:

Chapter 18. Lord Chief Justice, Lord Bingham of Cornhill:

THE MOST JUST PRACTISING LAWYER:

Chapter 19. Counsel Richard Clayton

THE MOST JUST JUDGES:

Chapter 20. Mr. Justice Brooke:

Chapter 21. His Honour Judge Altman:

Chapter 22. His Honour Judge Prosser:

Chapter 23. Lord Denning:

IN CONCLUSION:

Chapter 24. People, People everywhere:

Chapter 25. Conclusion:

Chapter 26: Inspired Verses:

PRINTED & PUBLISHED

BY

LONDON TRUTH PUBLISHERS

DR. A ADOKO

10 SOANE HOUSE

ROLAND WAY

LONDON SE17 2JT

ISBN: 1 871694 05 1

CHAPTER 1.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

MILLENNIUM PRESENT TO THE VICTIMS OF

JUDICIAL CORRUPTION

The content of the book sounds very much like a wild burlesque. And, I wish it were. Unfortunately, it is a sinister reality. Nor is it a unique sinister reality. It is about common place corruption, within our courts of law. And, still much more within our legal system i.e. the Law Society and the Bar of England and Wales.

What is written here, is the tip of the iceberg. I was embarrassed, not by the paucity, but, by the abundance of the incidences of judicial abuses of power, from which I had to select, what to publish, and what to leave unpublished. It reminded me of the claim made in the Bible, that if everything that Jesus said and did were written down, the world would not be able to hold the publication!

COMPARATIVE STUDY:

The enormity of the offences of corruption, dealt with may be brought home by comparing what our corrupt judges and lawyers have done, with what Jonathan Atkin and Oscar Wilde did. Both Jonathan Atkin and Oscar Wilde ended up in prison. The charge against them was perjury, that is, telling lies in court. Yet, many of our judges, who have committed worse offences, are still trying cases!

THE NEED TO SPEAL OUT:

It is necessary to the commonwealth of justice, for all persons, especially those of us who are lawyers, to uphold justice without fear or favour. And we should do so, even if, by so doing, the firmament may fall upon us. In an effort to ensure that a few frogs do not pollute the source of the well of

justice, this book is written. It is my millennium present to the victims, in England and Wales, of judicial abuses of power.

It has been said that:

"No individual however ... resourceful, can bring a court into disrepute ... The conduct of the judiciary itself and not the individual or group criticising it. determines whether or not it is respected".

Indeed, honest judges do welcome criticisms. As Lord Denning puts it:

We will never use this jurisdiction to uphold our own dignity ... Nor will we use it to suppress those who speak against us. We do not fear criticisms. Nor do we resent it. For there is something more important at stake. It is no less than the freedom of speech itself".

There is no law, which make judges immune from the legal consequences of their false oaths. Indeed, the provision of s. 4(1) of the Criminal Law Act 1968 makes it mandatory that their criminal offences should be reported to authorities. It is now the practice in England, as is seen in the case of Jonathan Atkin, and Hamilton and of other ministers, that a case alleging sleaze, in a public office, is first reported in a media of public opinion. This book, is that media of public opinion.

In accordance with the requirement of the law, a copy of this book will be sent to the Lord Chancellor, by way of a formal complaint. It will stress the fact that the judges, whose conduct is criticised in this book, are not fit and proper

persons to be judges. It will demand that a public investigation of the serious accusations of gross misconduct made against those judges. Further, it will insist that those judges be tried for the criminal offences that they have committed i.e. the course of justice, or defeating the end of justice.

THE OFFENCE OF DEFEATING JUSTICE BY SWEARING FALSE OATH:

It does not make sense that these judges should escape scot-free from the offence, for instance, of perjury that they have committed. The more so when persons like Jonathan Atkin and Oscar Wilde are made to suffer grievously, for the offence of perjury. Indeed, the offence of perjury committed by Jonathan Atkin and Oscar Wilde, compared to the offence of perjury committed by the corrupt judges such as Lord Bingham, Mr. Justice Morrison and Judge David Booth, to name but a few, look like a grain of sand, compared to a huge balloon!

The charges against Oscar Wilde and Jonathan Atkin were merely that they had committed breaches of a witness' oath, to tell the truth. But, these judges have committed breaches of their Oath of Loyalty to the Sovereign, as well as their Judicial Oath, plus the offence of swearing falsely, in the name of God!

The 3 oaths, which those judges have broken, are as follows.

First, in their Oath of Allegiance to the Sovereign, all these

judges had sworn that they would:

Well and truly serve our sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth the Second, in their various judicial offices.

Second, in their Judicial Oath, all the judges had sworn to:

Do right to all manner of people after the laws and usage of this realm, without fear or favour, affection or ill-will.

Third, all the judges ended the swearing of their Judicial Oath, by calling upon Providence. Each said:

So help me God.

Yet, all of them, in the course of their duty as judges, have maliciously committed atrocious breaches of the oaths to the Sovereign, the Court and to God.

THE OFFENCE OF DEFEATING JUSTICE BY IGNORING ISSUES:

The legal requirement about what a judge should and should not deal with, may be said to have had it origin in our prayer book. The prayer book commands us not to leave undone that which we ought to do, and not to do that which we ought not to do. The law requires judges to deal with the issues raised in the case before them, by giving their reasons for determining those issues, in one way, or the other. in the cases that I have brought against the Law Society, the judges invariably ignored to deal with the issues that I had raised! The reason is quite clear. If they dealt with those issues, they would have had no alternative, but to make a ruling in my favour.

However, since, they had already conspired to defeat justice, they had no alternative but to avoid dealing with the issues raised by me! Their conduct, could not merely be explained in terms of judicial bias. It was the very definition of the offence of a conspiracy to defeat the end of justice!

Just as a judge would have to be insane to deny that the object of the eye, is to see and, of the ear, is to hear, so would he be insane, to deny that the object of judgement, is to determine the issues in the dispute between the parties. There can therefore, be no defence, in law or in fact, to a judgement, which ignores to deal with the issues that constitute the cause of action or the grounds of appeal. Just as no judge dares say that he believes in the self-contradiction, or in the existence of the impossible, so, no judge dares say that he believes that the purpose of pleading causes of action, or grounds of appeal, is for him to ignore them!

Consequently, judgements which ignore causes of action, or grounds of appeal, such as the judgements of Mr. Justice Potts, Mr. Justice Morris Kay, Judge Mitchel, and Judge David Booth etc are, law and in fact, a confession by the judges concerned, that they have maliciously defeated the end of justice. And that confession constitutes grounds for prosecuting them for the criminal offence of a conspiracy to defeat the end of justice.

According to the law, as stated by the Court of Appeal, a fully judicial body, is required by natural justice to give

"Sufficient reasons for its decision to enable the parties to

know the issue to which it addressed its mind and acted lawfully". See R v. Civil Service Appeal Board, ex parte, Cunningham [1991] 4 All E.R. 310 at 318 as per Lord Donaldson M.R.

The most corrupt judge in the country, Mr. David Booth, does not merely ignore issues in a case. He goes all the way out to conceal material evidence from assessors! His conduct is like that of the watchdog who steals the property in its trust. Or that of a father, who sexually assaults his minor daughter. He cannot be trusted.

THE OFFENCE OF DEFEATING JUSTICE BY SECRET BRIEFINGS:

The offence of giving judgement on the basis, not according to evidence as required by law, but according to secret briefings sent to judges has now become prevalent! Suson Forscey-Moore, of Campaign for a Fair Hearing, discovered a written secret briefing, warning the Court of Appeal, in case number FC2 96/6193/E (LTA 96/5619) against the plaintiff, Geoffrey Harold Scriven! Mrs. Moore carried out necessary investigations, and learnt that such Secret Briefings to judges, was not an exception to the rule, but the order of the day!

Accordingly, she wrote a strong complaint, denouncing the judicial Secret Briefings, as judicial corruption. The prejudicial Secret Briefing to the judges of the Court of

Appeal, stated:

"It will be noted that after reading the Attached Affidavit, Lord Justice Russell directed that the papers should be submitted to Her Majesty's Attorney General to consider what further action, if any, he should take in the public interest. The Court should be warned, that the present Plaintiff has made it clear in discussions with the writer on the telephone that he has completely misinterpreted the basis of the referral. The writer has not commented in response to his expression of delight that Lord Justice Russell has referred the topic of alleged perjury committed by Lords and Lady Justices of Appeal to the Attorney General for further investigations. The Plaintiff has no idea he is the subject of the referral"!

Judges being human, and human nature being what it is, Secret Briefings of the kind, warning the judges that a litigant was a dangerous person, who accused judges of perjury and corruption etc, could not fail in their object. Indeed, it did not fail in its object! Geoffrey Harold Scriven narrowly escaped criminal penalty.

Nor indeed, did it fail in its object in the cases I brought against the Law Society! Look, for instance, at my appeal against the judgement of Chairman Donnelly! The appeal was based on very serious judicial misconduct:

The misconduct of Judge Donnelly accepting a bribe!

The misconduct of Judge Donnelly receiving blackmailing letter from solicitor Robin Lewis and complying with the

term of the blackmail!

Yet my appeal did not succeed! Why did it fail?

The answer is, because of secret briefing! In his judgement, Mr. Justice Mummery, who determined the appeal himself, confessed, without shame, that the appeal failed on the basis of a secret briefing that he had received from the bribed and blackmailed Judge Donnelly! Up to now, I do not know the content of the secret briefing, which is the basis upon which my appeal was determined! I hope and pray that the Lord Chancellor will cause an investigation to take place and then, I will know the content of the secret briefing and give an answer to it!

In its campaign to judges, the Law Society seems to have made my accusation of their officials to appear as a violation of the Law Society franchises! Consequently, my publication of the crimes committed by the Law Society officials was treated, by the court, as the kind of conduct that the court must severely punish! I was to be compelled, by a denial of my right to practise law, to kneel before the Law Society and to apologise for publishing the offences of the Law Society officials! I was to be denied an opportunity to earn a penny of income, as a practising solicitor!

Some of the judges who conspired to defeat the end of justice still show some conscience. For instance, Mr. Justice Morrison and Mr. Justice Potts were, at least, so ashamed of their fictitious judgements, that they did not have the courage to deliver the figments of their minds, which they called

judgements, in an open court, attended by their judicial victim! In order to prevent me from attending the deliverance of his judgements, Mr. Justice Potts dared not deliver it in London! He insisted on delivering it in Leeds, in the absence of the parties! Had the courage to deliver his judgement in London, in my presence, I would have had the discourtesy to call him by the name that describes him best:

A Wolf in Sheep's Clothing.

And had Mr. Justice Morrison had the courage to deliver his judgement in open court, in my presence, I would have called him, in his face:

"Sir, Macbeth might have murdered sleep. But you have murdered Justice".

I did, however, had the courage to tell Chairman Booth that he was who he is:

The Most Corrupt Judge in England. And A Racist!

BIBLICAL DESCRIPTION OF INJUSTICE:

The Bible describes well, the conduct of these corrupt judges. Their conduct is not different from the conduct of bad parents. When litigants ask for bread, these corrupt judges, like bad parents, give stones. When litigants asked for fish, they give snakes! When we ask Morrison for Justice, he gives us

Injustice. And when we ask Booth for Judicial Determination, he gives us Malicious Determination!

By their own conduct, they have opted out of being judges. They should be butchering cows, and weighing meat.

LEGAL MAFIA:

During the trial of the several cases that I brought against the Law Society, it became clear, why the Law Society hired Lord Lester Q.C. and Solicitor Robin Lewis to represent it! The legal practice of Lord Lester and Solicitor Robin Lewis is essentially Mafia in nature! Lester and Lewis were hired to represent the Law Society solely because of their ability to corrupt the judiciary!

There is absolutely no question that there are some officials of the Law Society, to whom justice is fearful for its own sake. They are like former President Iddi Amin of Uganda, who, having no academic qualification, held that persons with academic qualifications, were fools fit only to be hewers of wood and drawers of water!

These owl-like creatures of darkness, known as the Gang of Four, are:

The Law Society Director John Rendall

Head of Department Nicholas Saunders.

Legal Adviser Anne Coles.

And Manager Mark Hone.

A DEMIGOD:

There is nothing more natural than that those of us brought up under the English system of law should find ourselves addicted to crying ourselves up, as belonging to the best legal system in the world. I never heard a single person cry us down as being a part of a legal system, which was not the best in the world. I had taken for granted that when those addicted to such puffing, stoop to conspire against justice, they would, because of such puffing, at least commit a breach of justice, while still appearing to be doing justice.

I was thus shocked that a number of judges in England go all the way out to publish at least where black people are concerned, that they are neither doing justice, nor pretending to do justice!

Again, there is nothing more natural that a person brought up under the English system of law, as I am, should have entertained the greatest respect and even affection towards our judges. In terms of his independence, and above all, in terms of his unshakeable impartiality as a judge, a person like Lord Denning has always been, to me, as some sort of demigod.

THE SINS OF INJUSTICE & THE VIRTUE OF

JUSTICE:

Hence, upon the heads of those corrupt judges, the sins of injustice must be heaped. And, it must be seen to be heaped.

And upon the heads of the just judges, such as Lord Denning, Mr. Justice Brooke, His Honour Judge Altman and his Honour Judge Prosser the virtue of justice must be heaped. And it must be seen to be heaped.

Adlai Stevenson once described a free society, as a society, where it is safe to be unpopular. We should not allow our corrupt judges to succeed to describe our free society as:

A society, where it is safe for corrupt judges, to defeat the end of justice!

29/09/1993: BREACH OF POLICY & OF LAW:

On 29/09/1993 the Law Society again reconsidered my application for exemption. It again refused to exempt me. This decision was, on the face of the record, manifestly unlawful on 4 grounds:

First, the decision made me the first and the only person refused exemption under the Law Society policy, which gives automatic exemption, to any English Barrister who have practised law in the office of English Solicitors, for 2 years. I had by then, practised law in the offices of English Solicitors for about 3 years.

Second, the decision also made me the first and the only person refused exemption under the Law Society policy, which gives automatic exemption to English Barristers recommended for exemption, by their supervising English Solicitors. In accordance with that policy, the Law Society, itself, wrote letters to my supervising solicitors to comment on my legal practice. The testimonials, from both the firms of solicitors, certified that I had a comprehensive knowledge of the work of solicitors and that I was a competent legal practitioner. It is important to note two points.

1. The letter of the Law Society asked for competency in legal practice as a solicitor. It did not ask the Solicitors to comment specifically about knowledge of accounts.

2. If there was a material omission in the testimonial, the Law Society had a duty to ask the Solicitors concerned to supply them.

Third the decision made me the first and the only English Barrister refused exemption under the Law Society Policy that those whose legal practice abroad, was based on the English rule of legal practice, should be exempted. The assumption is that they know the rules. Since Uganda was a colony of Britain, its rules of legal practice is word by word the same as that in Britain. The only exception is that, Uganda rule refers to the legal practitioner as an "advocate". The English rules refers to him as a "solicitor". Although I photocopied the rules, and sent them to the Law Society, with the comment that the two sets of rules were identical, yet, the Legal Adviser of the Law Society, Mrs. Anne Coles, insisted that there was

no similarity!

Fourth, although I kept on demanding, as the law requires me to demand, that I be told the kind of information that I am required to produce, in order to be exempted, yet, no reply was ever given to that demand. Instead, I kept on receiving letters from the Law Society, asking whether there was something else that I wanted to add! Then, some years later, in 1995, when Judge Altman had pointed out that I was not being treated fairly, the Law Society ultimately informed me that I should get a letter from a solicitor, confirming that I knew solicitors' accounts. I got the letter. And was then exempted!

01/10/1993: LESTER AND HONE COMMIT PERJURY.

On or about 01 October 1993, the Law Society Manager, Mr. Mark Hone, swore a false affidavit deliberately meant to mislead the High Court! The false affidavit was prepared by Lord Lester Q.C. who knew that its content was false. The affidavit, sworn before solicitor J C Hoodman, was lodged in the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court in Crown Office Application number CO/1457/93. The Affidavit was intended to mislead the court to believe that I had been treated as other Senior English Barristers who were had failed the test.

As a matter of fact there had never been a senior English Barristers who had failed the test. And the Law Society during the Industrial Tribunal proceedings for discrimination ultimately admitted the lie! At all material time, Lord Lester

knew that the affidavit was false! He knew that:

1. No White English Barrister had been refused exemption on the ground of failing the test! Indeed, he knew that no White English Barrister could be refused exemption on the ground of test since, in the first place, they were not required to take the test. In the second place, they were being exempted, as proved below, on the strength of their confession of ignorance, not of knowledge, of the Solicitors' Accounts!

2. The Affidavit was intended to mislead the court to believe that I had been refused exemption by virtue of the provisions of the guidelines for exemption of English Barristers, which had also been used in other cases. It did not tell the court that the guidelines had been specifically prepared, in April 1993, to provide the Law Society with a defence against my complaint of racial discrimination! Lord Lester was deliberately putting the horse before the cart! The guidelines was not responsible for refusal to exempt me! It was refusal to exempt me, which forced the Law Society to draw the guidelines to justify its refusal!

3. The Affidavit deliberately misled the court by stating that I had obtained marks below that required for passing the test in the subjects without pointing out that I had obtained 43% marks which is over the 33% marks required for exemption.

4. The affidavit misled the court by giving it the impression that I did not produce enough proof of knowledge to be exempted. The fact is that I was the only candidate who produced maximum proof of knowledge required by the law!

5. In order to mislead the court, the affidavit deliberately omitted to refer to the fact that the Law Society had maliciously refused to exempt me under its various exemption policies, which made it mandatory for me to be exempted! For instance:

- The policy of 2 years legal practice in the offices of solicitors.

- The policy of accepting recommendation by supervising solicitors.

- The policy of exempting barristers whose legal practice abroad is governed by rules similar to those in England and Wales etc.

05/10/1994:

1. THE LAW SOCIETY CONFESSES RACIAL DISCRIMINATION.

2. IT UNLAWFULLY DECIDES TO SUSPEND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LAW!

3. THE SUSPENCION WAS A GIGANTIC FRAUD!

On 05 October 1994, when it was only 3 weeks for the Industrial Tribunal to hear my case for racial discrimination, the Law Society ultimately capitulated. It admitted, for the first time, that its exemption policy, contained in its guidelines for exemption of English barristers, had indirectly, not

directly, discriminated against me.

My amended pleading of racial discrimination in the Industrial Tribunal was responsible for the Law Society admission of racial discrimination. The pleading compared and contrasted the way I was treated with the way my white colleagues were treated:

- Mr. Garry Pegg; British/White was called to the Bar in 1981. I was called to the Bar in 1960.

- He had never attended a course in the 2 subjects. I had.

- He had never carried out any legal practice, which involved knowledge of professional conduct and accounts. His application admits his ignorance in the 2 subjects. His specialisation was in energy and natural resources. My legal practice, for several years, was governed by the English rules of Professional Conduct and Solicitors' Accounts.

- He was exempted. I was refused exemption!

- Mr. Peter Sinnet: British/White was called to the Bar in November 1984. I was called to the Bar in 1960.

- He had never attended a course in the 2 subjects. I had.

- He had never carried out any legal practice, which involved knowledge of professional conduct and accounts. His application admitted his ignorance in the 2 subjects. His specialisation was in legal aspects relating to life assurance and pension business. . My legal practice, for several years,

was governed by the English rules of Professional Conduct and Solicitors' Accounts.

- He was exempted. I was refused exemption!

- Mr. David Friar: British/White was called to the Bar in 1987. I was called to the Bar in 1960.

- He had never attended a course in the 2 subjects. I had.

- He had never carried out any legal practice which involved knowledge of professional conduct and accounts. His application admitted ignorance in the 2 subjects. His had been clerk to the justices. . My legal practice, for several years, was governed by the English rules of Professional Conduct and Solicitors' Accounts.

He was exempted. I was refused exemption!

However, in spite of its admission of racial discrimination, the Law Society decided never to make any amends! It decided, in effect, to stop my racial discrimination under the guidelines, but to continue it, by refusing to implement the law that enables me to be exempted! So, it resolved that its guidelines for exemption of English Barristers be revoked. And it was revoked on that day. It also resolved to suspend implementation of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers Transfer Regulations under which I had applied for exemption! The suspension was alleged to have also taken immediate effect.

The sole purpose of the suspension, of the law of the nation,

was to prevent me from being exempted! And it did!

The alleged suspension was, however, a gigantic fraud. The exemption of the White English Barristers continued unabated!

31/10/94 , 01/11/94 & 02/11/1994:

CONTEMPT OF COURT:

On 31/10/94 as well as on 01 and 02/11/94 Lord Lester treated the Industrial Tribunal with so much contempt and bulldozed his way through it by the use of guerrilla ambush tactics that justice was neither done nor seen as done! The account of what happened is given in Chapter 8 entitled: Lord Lester of Herne Q.C. All the same, on the strength of the admission of the Law Society, that it had indirectly discriminated against me by virtue of its guidelines, the Tribunal made the order that, the Law Society had indirectly discriminated against me, on racial grounds! At long last, I had proved that the Law Society had discriminated against me on racial grounds.

CHAPTER 2.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT LAWYERS:

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS IN RACIAL DISCRIMINATION CASES:

The facts constituting the cause of complaint, are hereby stated, as chronology of events:

I was born on 01/01/1931 in Uganda in East Africa. On 09/02/1960, I was awarded the degree of the Utter Bar, also known as Barrister-at-Law Degree, by the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple, London.

From 1960 to 1962 I practised law in the British Colony of Uganda. And, from 1962 to 1986 I practised law in the independent states of Uganda and Tanzania.

In 1969-1971 I was elected President of the Uganda Law Society.

In 1986 I sought and was granted refugee status in the United Kingdom. I was subsequently given permanent residence in the United Kingdom.

Though an English Barrister, I was denied the right to practice law as a barrister, till 1989!

17/12/1989: GIVING MISLEADING INFORMATION:

On 17/12/1989 I applied, in my capacity as a senior English Barrister, to be allowed to practise law as a solicitor. At the time, English Barristers with 8 years of legal practice, were given automatic exemption from sitting for a test in

Professional Conduct and Accounts. I had then practised law as a Barrister for 28 years. By the nature of its duty as public servant, the Law Society owed me a duty to inform me of my entitlement to exemption, from sitting for any test, to become a solicitor. It did not discharge that duty. On the contrary, it deliberately misled me to believe that I was not entitled to be exempted! It informed me that, by virtue of the provision of the Overseas Admission Order, I did not qualify for admission as a solicitor!

01/05/1991: RACIAL DISCRIMINATION BY CONCEALMENT AND MISLEADING INFORMATION:

On 08/01/1991 I again applied for admission as a solicitor. On 01/05/1991 the executive of the Law Society recommended that I be exempted from doing any test, in order to become a solicitor. It further recommended that I be required to work in the firm of English Solicitors before admission as a solicitor. The exemption committee turned down this recommendation. It ruled that, in order for me to be admitted as a solicitor, I was required to sit for a test in 2 subjects, namely, professional conduct and solicitors' accounts. The decision treated me less favourably than my colleagues the White English Barristers who were exempted. It was thus, in law, racially discriminatory.

01/05/1991: RACIAL DISCRIMINATION ON THE FALSE EXCUSE OF MARKS:

On 27/01/1993 the Law Society refused to exempt me. The main excuse was that I sat twice, for a test in the 2 subjects,

but failed to get exemption marks! The excuse was manifestly false. In the first place, I had produced more proof of knowledge in the 2 subjects, than any White Barrister ever exempted! Indeed, every white barrister exempted had confessed his absolute ignorance in the 2 subjects! I had produced the following proof of knowledge in the 2 subjects:

i).I had practised law as a barrister for 25 years.

ii). My legal practice was based on the same rules in England.

1. I had attended the course, organised by the Law Society, in the 2 subjects.

2. I had obtained 43% marks in the 2 subjects i.e. over and above the marks required for exemption.

3. I had, at the time, worked in the offices of English solicitors for over a year.

In the second place, the marks required for exemption was the same as the passing marks for the Bar examinations. It is only 33% marks! On both the occasions, I obtained more than 33% marks. On the second occasion, I obtained 43% marks. It is a higher mark than the marks obtained by the Law Society Counsel, Lord Lester Q.C. Like me, he too passed his Bar in third grade. But, in my time, that is, in the late fifties, all candidates, apart from a handful, passed in third grade. In Lester's time, in 1993, there had been drastic improvements. Yet, the aggregate passing marks for Lord Lester was in the low thirty! For Lester, whose legal practice is based on the poorest pass marks, to advocate refusing me legal practice, on

the basis that I had obtained much higher marks than that obtained by him, is proof of the kind of fraudster he is.

I was thus obliged to appeal against the decision that racially discriminated against me on the false excuse of marks.

09/04/1993: RACIAL DISCRIMINATION ON THE FALSE EXCUSE OF GUIDELINES:

My appeal was due to be heard and determined on 09/04/1993. My appeal was bound to succeed on the strength of my ground of appeal that I had produced more proof of knowledge than any exempted English Barrister. And so, Lord Lester was again called in to advise the Law Society on the legal excuse to be given for refusing me exemption! According to the Law Society, the advice of Lord Lester was that written guidelines for the implementation of the exemption law be drawn in such a way that I could be lawfully refused exemption! And so, in April 1993, a couple of days before the hearing of my appeal on 09/04/99, the guidelines was drawn. It was called:

"Guidelines for Operation of Delegated Powers: ... Exemption under Regulation 6".

It provided that English Barristers will be given automatic exemption only on the condition that:

"Since their call to the Bar they have gained at least 8 years experience of legal practice in England and Wales..."

As I had not practised law in England for 8 years, my appeal was promptly dismissed by virtue of the provision of the written guidelines!

14/07/1993: BREACH OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT:

On 14/07/93 the exemption committee of the Law Society met to consider my further application for exemption. They refused to consider my application on the ground that I had applied for judicial review of there past decision! I pointed out to them that their decision was a breach of my fundamental right. They were punishing me for having exercised my fundamental right, to seek redress from a court of law! Lord Lester had not seen that point! He now saw it. And he advised the Law Society to reverse its decision and consider the application.

CHAPTER 3.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT LAWYERS:

THE GANG OF FOUR:RENDALL, SAUNDERS, HONE AND COLES.

THE GANG OF FOUR:RENDALL, SAUNDERS, HONE

AND COLES.

The Law Society Gang of Four, Director John Rendall, Head of Department Nicholas Saunders, Legal Adviser Anne Coles and Manager Mark Hone are like a raven which sees virtue but croaks: "Vice, vice"!

HARBOUR OF CRIMINALS:
They have reduced the Law Society into an organisation shielding and harbouring criminals of their type! They continue to deny men of talents and integrity, admission to become solicitors, merely because they dare point out the racial discrimination within the Law Society! Or merely because they dare point out the criminal offences committed by the Law Society officials!

The problem between the Law Society and me arose from a simple complaint, on my part. I complained that the Law Society had refused to exempt me from sitting for a test to become a solicitors, on racial grounds as I had supplied more proof of knowledge than my White colleagues who were exempted. The complaint was treated as something atrocious! As an unheard of form of profanation! To the Gang of Four, it was tolerable for a white barrister to complain against the powerful figures in the Law Society. Such a complaint would merely have been one of those things.

FANTASTIC TRICKS:
But, for a black man to complain against the officials of the Law Society was intolerable! Since I had made the mistake to

complain, then, I was ti be taught a lesson that I was never to forget! I was never to be allowed to practice law as a solicitor! It was as simple as that. Shakespeare must have had the Gang of Four in mind when he stated:

"Man, proud man,

Drest in a little brief authority,

Most ignorant of what he's most assur'd,

His glassy essence, like an angry ape,

Plays each fantastic tricks before high heaven,

As makes an angel weep".

There is only one course open to the Law Society. They either interdict freedom of criticism. Or permit it. The Law Society purports to do both. It theory it claims to permit criticisms. In fact it interdicts criticisms most severely. Once your name has entered the Law Society Black Book for having criticised it, it is a foregone conclusion that ways will be found to prevent you from practising law as a solicitor

STRENGTH IN HONESTY:

It seems as if, the only way the Gang of Four would allow me to practise law as a solicitor is for me to be reduced to fawn upon them as if I were a child, and they were my nurses. But, I was not a child. Nor were they my nurses. Their threats were

thus wasted. It is always futile to threatened virtue. As Caesar told Cassius:

"There is no terror Cassius in your threats;

For I am arm'd so strong in honesty

That they pass by me as the idle wind

Which I respect not".

I became a lawyer, not to beg for my right, but to demand it. And I demanded it.

FRUITS OF OPPRESSION:

Perhaps the Gang of Four should have learnt a lesson from the mighty lion. Even the mighty lion, does not crash little squirrels for squeaking against it. It feels powerful enough not to be threatened by weaklings. Not the Gang of Four of the Law Society. Nonentities like Rendall and Hone, thrusted in the position of the leadership of the Law Society, felt so unsafe, that they were determined to silence, with a hammer, almost every complainant, however justified the complaint!

Such oppression and suppression give birth to resistance. Resistance is never a cause. It is always an effect. This book is thus the fruit of oppression and suppression that the Law Society has sown. Just as figs, from thorns, are not gathered,

so, violation of human rights of nonentities does not entrench the privileges of public officials concerned. On the contrary, it is bound to give birth to challenges. And, challenges publish and undermine abuses of power.

Indeed, since I raised the complaint and prosecuted it for all these years, the Law Society itself admits that changes intended to bring about equality of opportunity are taking place. Old order is changing. It is yielding place to new. This book welcomes such changes. It continues to demands that I be made a part of it. Indeed, this book is itself a tide for that change. And that tide must continue to be taken if the image of the Law Society of arbitrariness, racial discrimination, oppression, and being above the law, is to be reversed.

A MAFIA ORGANISATION:

Incidences that prove, beyond reasonable doubt, that the Law Society invariably acts as a Mafia organisation are given in the Chronology of Events and elsewhere. There is thus no need to repeat them here. But a simple illustration may be given here:

It took the Law Society more than 2 years, to let me know that as a senior English did Barrister, I was entitled to apply to be exempted from sitting for any test to become a solicitor.

Thereafter, it took the Law Society more than 2 years again, to tell me that the only proof I was required to furnish, in order to become a solicitor, was to get a letter from a solicitor, stating that I was conversant with Solicitors' account!

As will be seen in Chapter 28, from July 1997, the Law

Society reneged on its firm undertaking to consider my application for admission as a solicitor! All my requests to the Law Society to tell me what was happening were never answered! Letters written by my Councillor and Bromley Race Equality Council were, at first, not answered. Subsequently they were answered with firm undertaking that I would be receiving letters shortly asking me to attend the interview for admission. The undertakings were all broken!

At the beginning of the dispute the Gang of Four never lacked a plea for refusing or delaying my admission as a solicitor:

1. Inadequate marks.

2. Lack of time to process my application.

3. Undue delays in answering my letters.

4. Complete refusal to answer my letters.

5. The need to take stock, for several months, of cases that I have brought against the Law Society.

6. The need to search for an expert who could advise the Law Society on the nature of law that I practised in Uganda!

7. The need to appoint a commission to study the laws of Uganda that I practised.

8. The need to wait for a report of the said commission.

9. The need to devise a special oral test for me!

10.The need not to apply the 2 Year Legal Practice Policy and Similar Practising Rule to me!

11.The need to postpone implementation of the exemption law.

12.The need to wait for the formulation of another exemption guidelines.

13.The undue delay in formulating another exemption guidelines, and so on and so forth.

THE LAW OF THE JUNGLE:

It is clear from above, that at all material time, the conduct of the Gang of Four, was governed entirely by the Law of the Jungle. As Wordsworth puts it:

"That they should take who have the power,

And they should keep who can "

The Gang of Four had the power. And, they took away, my legal right to practice law. I tried to keep my legal right. But I

could not. I was too weak. They were too strong.

I cried, oh, how I cried for some kind British person to come to my rescue! It was all in vain! It is a shame to find out how easily many outstanding people capitulate to the name of the Law Society.

My former Headmaster, Mr. Samwiri George Okello Olong once told me about the 'bravery' of the Amin soldiers! The soldiers, he said, laughed all the time:

He had watched soldiers take out their guns. They were laughing! He watched them load their guns. They were laughing! He watched them aim the guns at the civilian. They were still laughing! He watched the civilians run for their lives. The soldiers were laughing! He heard one of the soldiers joke:

Let us see whether they run faster than the bullets!

The soldiers laughed hilariously at that! He watched the soldiers open fire on the civilians! They were still laughing. He watched four civilians fall down dead. The soldiers were still laughing! That was how 'brave' the Amin soldiers were!

So, Okello fled to Tanzania where he joined a guerrilla movement. He returned to ambush those soldiers in Tororo. The guerrilla surrounded Tororo Army Barrack. At dawn, they rained bullets on the huts of those 'brave' soldiers. There was a pandemonium! The 'brave' soldiers fled from their barrack! Some fled naked! They ran like frightened rabbits! Okello could not contain himself. He forgot all about the

battle. He laughed like a madman!

The Gang of Four are as brave as those Amin soldiers. They abuse the power in their hands. They dare only attack the defenceless. The nonentities. It goes without saying, that should the table be turned against them, the 'brave' officials, would run like frightened rabbits!

A BAIT: What the Gang of Four do not know, is that their false pleas for abuse of power, which they considered to be a trap for me, was actually a bait for catching them! And, as this book shows, the trap caught them red-handed!

A MARTYR:

As long as such injustice continues to be the rule that governs the Law Society, that long will there be martyrs for justice. Throughout the 10 years of injustice that I have suffered in the hands of the Law Society, from December 1989 to November 1999, when this book was published, I have displayed predominantly, two attributes:

1. I have always fought against injustice.

2. I have always fought in the open.

I have written several books about injustice including, **Coups**

and Corruption in Africa, Mr. Minister: A Study of Naked Ambition. My Internet Magazine, **Anti Sleaze Magazine**, has published several articles on abuses of power including: A public enquiry of Financial Controller Michael Lygo for Theft and Fraud, Disciplinary Action against Industrial Tribunal Chairman, Judge David Booth for Racism, Bias, and Judicial Corruption, Gross Misconduct on the Part of Lord Anthony Paul Lester Q.C. etc. etc.

OFFICIAL STATUS:

On its part, the Law Society believes in secret whisper campaign. It dares not carry out an open campaign against me. It believes that the more mud it secretly threw at me, the more chances the mud had, of sticking! Better still, the less chances they have of being called upon to answer for it! As a result of such secret mud throwing:

- The Legal Aid Board was unlawfully induced to refuse to give me legal Aid funds to sue the Law Society! (See Chapter 18).

- The Office for the Supervision of Solicitors was directed to stop me from practising law in the offices of solicitors! Why? Because I wrote an article, on my Internet, the Anti-Sleaze Magazine disclosing gross embezzlement of funds for sick children in the Great Ormond Street Hospital! The Chief Accountant of the Hospital, Mr. Michael Lygo, specialised in the use of public funds, to bribe officials. The charges against

me are so irrational, that the only explanation for them is that Chief Accountant Lygo, bribed somebody high up to insist on them. (See Chapter 19).

- Even some Home Office Officials were contacted to renege of their official duty!

- My member of Parliament was contacted to refuse to answer my letters and subsequently, to refuse to assist me with my grievances against the Law Society! (See Chapter 28).

So much official antagonism was brought to bear on me that the breakdown of my marriage became inevitable. For the sake of the children we were obliged to settle for matrimonial separation.

This kind of secret mud slinging is the very definition of irresponsibility and cowardice.

Like the hound, the Gang of Four always attacks as pack. Their conduct amounts to an admission, on their part, that, individually, none of them was my match! It was their position in the Law Society that was my match! They are thus, like the Aesop's kid, who, having mounted on the roof of a house, reviled the wolf bitterly. And, by virtue of their admission, I am, compared to them, like the Aesop's wolf, whose sole answer to the kid was:

"Coward, it is not you who revile me, but the place on which you are standing".

THE OLIVE BRANCH:

I did not want to keep on worrying about the perpetual harassment by the Gang of Four. I had no doubt in my mind that they too would be relieved to get me out of their back. After all, they had done their worst. By disclosing what they did to me, I had also hit back. And so, I continued to ask them for reconciliation. At long last, the Law Society agreed that we meet. I regarded the meeting as an opportunity, which had never offered itself, and might never offer itself, for reconciliation. Hence the need to do everything to make it succeed. I prepared threefold terms of the agreement for reconciliation. They were:

1. We take note of the lesson that we have learnt from our past differences and quarrels. The lesson, as I saw it, was the need for give and take. The need for a compromise.

2. In the spirit of that lesson, we should let bygone be bygone i.e. we were to cease harping on the rightness or wrongness of what the other party did. Instead, we should endeavour to reach the kind of settlement that I had with the Bar of England and the Judiciary namely that, after my one-year suspension, I would resume my legal practice as a barrister. In the case of the Law Society I would start practice as a solicitor.

3. Lastly, that the Law Society should also, as the Bar of England and Wales had done, undertake not to enforce the order for costs, made against me, in their favour, by the Kangaroo Courts.

The Law Society accepted the first condition. They pleaded

lack of jurisdiction to accepting the second condition. They rejected the third condition:

1. It accepted that the past could not be forgotten.

2. It claimed to have no jurisdiction to give an undertaking about my admission as a solicitor! It argued that the authority to admit me into the Rolls of Solicitors was vested in its admission committee. However, it undertook to place my application for admission as a solicitor, to the admission committee as soon as my suspension had ended in July 1998.

3. It refused to wave payment of costs, ordered by the Court, for me to pay to them. One such costs exceeded Ł8000! It was awarded by on the strength of the order by Chairman Booth, in spite of the fact that, under the law, the maximum cost that could be awarded, should not exceed Ł150! (It is to be noted that on my appeal against that order for cost, the Employment Appeal Tribunal did not award the cost. Did not even comment on it). Significantly, the sole reason given by the Law Society, for insisting on my undertaking to pay costs to it, was that they were not sure about me! They did not know, so they said, what I was up to! What I might do next! So, although they were not going to wave cost, they would not necessarily enforce it. It short, it was to remain hanging over my head, as the sword of Demacles.

I pointed out that, they ought to have known by then, that I was a man of my word. I do not say in secret, what I cannot say in public. When I said that I would fight against a given decision, I fought against it. When I said that I would not do so, I did not do so. I was not the enigma.

On the other hand, I was not a horse either. I obeyed no rein. I did not trot or gallop as commanded. I was like a deer. I ran or walked wherever I pleased. My sole restraint was truth. My word was my life. It was as simple as that.

All my efforts at compromise was in vain. It would have succeeded, but the Law Society made the mistake of appointing Solicitor Robin Lewis as its co-ordinator. At no time did Solicitor Robin ever wanted the dispute settled. To him it was a duck that lays golden egg. He was not going to to butcher it!

If the lesson of history teaches anything at all, it is this: no crises has ever taken place which a timely concession would not have prevented. Look at the Kosovo War! Firmness is good to crush insubordination. But, where the authorities themselves admit that they have not entered the dispute with clean hands, then they have a duty to give concessions to prevent unnecessary escalation. Continued attempts to cover up of their misconduct could only lead, and indeed, it only led, to continued publication of their criminal offences.

THE SOUR GRAPE: You cannot suffer the kind of moral outrage that I suffered, without reliance on some moral pillar within you. Aesop told a story of a fox, which tried, in vain, to

get some ripe grapes hung too high for its reach. The poor fox was obliged to console himself saying:

"Take them who will. The grapes are sour".

My Sour Grape became the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus said: **Happy are those who are persecuted for righteousness. The Kingdom of God belongs to them.**

I was being persecuted for righteous complaint. I imagined, that through that verse, Jesus was telling me, that the Kingdom of God belongs to me! The corollary was that, the Kingdom of Hell, belonged to the Gang of Four!

There certainly was much truth in that passage. The Gang of Four had made themselves my persecutors. They had made me a victim of their persecution. For 10 years, they had denied me legal practice, as a solicitor! Now, the Bible was telling me, that although I was, indeed, their victim, on earth, yet, in heaven, the position might be reversed! The persecutors will become the persecuted!

When I thought deeply about the passage, the meaning of the apparent paradox became as clear as daylight. All that the Bible was saying is this:

- The Gang of Four have made me suffer in terms of material loss.

- Their lies and fraud have made them suffer in terms of spiritual loss!

Shakespeare, expresses the point more memorably. Said he, whoever steals from me my purse, steals trash.

'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands".

On the other hand, my publication of the gross abuse of power, committed by the Gang of Four, has filched from them, whatever good name they had falsely lay claim to. And, since they will continue to resist a public investigations of their conduct, they have lost their reputation, which is the ultimate human treasure. In the words of Shakespeare:

The purest treasure that mortal times afford is spotless reputation: that away,

Men are but gilded loan or painted clay.

Every word written here is absolutely privileged, by virtue being a statement of facts in cases heard in court, and by virtue of being expression of opinion on such facts. However, since no decision of any court obtained by corruption, fraud and blackmail, the facts is binding, the opinions expressed in this book call for judicial investigations. I therefore call for such a judicial investigation into judgements by corruption, blackmail and fraud, which have been perpetrated by the Gang of Four. I do so, knowing fully well that:

1. Any investigation would justify the truth of the facts in the book.

2. It would establish the fairness of the comments on the facts.

3. The Gang of Four who have so grossly abused the power of their office are more keen to cover up their transgressions and abominations, than to have them investigated.

4. In any case, the fact that these officials resorted to conspiracies to defeat the end of justice, is, in itself, a confession that exposure of the truth, will incriminate them. Hence they dare not become the instrument of their self incrimination.

CHAPTER 4.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT LAWYERS:

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE GANG OF FOUR:

DIRECTOR JOHN RENDALL:

The Law Society was cursed with a malignant and unprincipled director. His name is John Rendall. John Rendall is acknowledged as the evil spirit of the Law Society. He fits the description of Ovid's Evil Spirit who looked down on

majestic temples in the wealthy haven of Athens, and wept because she could find no cause to make her weep!

The key word to describe his directorate of the Law Society is that exemption of English Barristers was based wholly on hypocrisy! Rendall had succeeded to dispense with the legal requirement of proof of knowledge of legal practice rules. He had openly indulged in giving exemption to English Barristers whose only proof for exemption was their ignorance of the rules of legal practice! To make matters worse, he had started what is known as Toilet Exemptions! It was a top-secret exemption that did not go through exemption organs. No record of such exemptions was allowed to be seen or kept by the exemption committee of the Law Society! The names of persons so exempted remain the exclusive preserve of Rendall and his bosom friends! Even the court of law, the Industrial Tribunal, has been refused permission to see those names!

Apart from his evil propensity, the attribute that singled Rendall out and made you wonder about what was wrong with him, is his childish dogmatism. He has never given up his childish ways. He is a man of little understanding. In spite of his evil, he is in many ways, a grown up child.

His mind is characterised by a mixture of insensitivity and vagueness. His arguments exhibit a mind, rather narrow, and an intellect rather stunted.

His imagination and thought are superficial. No normal official would have devised the Toilet Exemptions! It is the superficiality of his imagination and thought, that prevents

him from conceiving the horror of running a public body on the basis of favouritism, kith and kin preference, and on the ground of racial discrimination.

He strikes me as a man who is cruel and evil, not because he means to be cruel and evil, but simply because, he is incapable of appreciating the consequences of cruelties and evil, upon others!

When a head of such a sensitive department, is insensitive, his junior officials get used to insensitivity. In due course, they tend to accept it as the norm of official conduct! Insensitivity becomes contagious. And that is what happened to the Law Society. Without such insensitivity, this book would never have been written.

When I was young, I fear dead bodies. When I grew up, I ceased to fear dead body. I began to fear dead soul. And that is why I fear Rendall:

Rendall has a dead soul!

No appeal however well founded would move him. After I had discovered that the Law Society controlled the court and dictated to the court the decision to be given, I was left with no alternative but to appeal to the Law Society, for an out of court settlement. As seen above, the main condition for a settlement was that neither side was to apologise to the other for what had happened. Both sides would agree to open a new chapter in their relationship.

I drew his attention to his duty as a public servant to act fairly.

He had already inflicted enough punishment upon me. The time had come for him to say: Enough is enough. Lord Denning M.R. explains the legal requirement thus:

"A public body must not misuse its power; and it is a misuse of power for it to act unfairly or unjustly towards a private citizen where there is no overriding public interest to warrant it. See: H.T.V. Ltd v. Price Commission [1976] 1 C.R. 170 at 185-186.

The Bar of England and Wales, and the Inns of Court of England and Wales, readily accepted the term for an out of court settlement. And we accordingly settled the dispute between us.

Rendall refused the term!

Rendall is a lawyer in name. Not in fact. He had no qualification in law. But, the nature of his duty makes him claim to be a lawyer, of some sort! His position as a top lawyer makes him claim that he knows what he does not know! Such a lawyer is generally worse than the worst trained lawyer:

He was more merciless, than a hanging prosecutor!

More dishonest, than a petty thief.

As was to be expected, from such an ignoble official, he perjured himself thoroughly, when he gave evidence in the Industrial Tribunal.

Invariably, Rendall uses his juniors as his shield! He is the senior official who does not fight his own battle. No, Sir. He sits at the background. From there, he indirectly incites strife, without taking part directly in it! Yet, as a head of department, it is his duty to save his juniors from blame, by implementing, in such cases, his own decisions. Rendall never allowed that to happen!

Above all, Rendall is a perjurer.

LAW SOCIETY'S HEAD OF DEPARTMENT:NICHOLAS SAUNDERS:

In my mind, the name of the Law Society's Head of Department, Nicholas Saunders, is intimately associated with that of Brutus. Just as Brutus had inflicted the "most unkindest cut of all" upon Caesar, so had Nicholas Saunder inflicted, the unfair punishment of all, upon me. And, just as Brutus was the noblest of all the plotters who assassinated Julius Caesar, so have I a nagging feeling that Nicholas Saunders may be the noblest person amongst the Law Society plotters against me. The feeling might have been inculcated by the undertone of his letters.

Indeed, the dispute started with a polite letter from him. It hinted that the Law Society was an impossible litigant. And that it might be in my best interest, not to resort to legal action. I continue to blame myself that I did not take his warning seriously. If I had, I would never have found myself

in this quandary.

I did not take his warning seriously because I believed implicitly in British justice. Had I even suspected that there was corruption within the British judiciary, I would not have threatened to bring an action. And, would not have done so.

Saunders was telling me, in legal language what the steward, in the Moliere's Miser, had said, namely, that with plenty of money, any person could make a fine dinner. Hence, the really good cook, was one who made a fine dinner, with no money at all. To Saunders:

With a good cause of action, any person could be a good litigant. Hence, the really good litigant, was one who won cases with no cause of action at all! And the really good litigant is the Law Society!

It never occurred to me that he was warning me that the Law Society literally induced judges to give a verdict in favour of the Law Society, regardless of the merit of the Law Society's case!

I soon learnt why the Law Society does not implement the law! Instead of implementing the law it implement the Principles, Guidelines, the Practice, the Policy and so on. This is because when the Law Society goes to court, it does not plead the law! It only pleads Principles and Policies. And judges understand that the Law Society Principles and Policies mean false justification for public consumption! As Bernard Shaw once put it, a corrupt official does everything

on principles:

He fights you on patriotic principles.

He robs you on business principle.

He enslaves you on imperial principle.

For the readers who are nonentity like me, the lesson that Nicholas Saunders sought to teach me is worth repeating:

Against the Law Society, an aggrieved individual is as helpless as against the elements. I was forced to accept and accepted that lesson.

· In the circumstances. It is in the best interest of an aggrieved person to lie down and rely on the mercies of the Law Society.

I tried to accept that lesson too. But the Law Society's mercies were never forthcoming. After waiting in vain for the mercies to be showered upon me as a drop of rain, I decided to continue to do something to obtain justice! It did not matter whether my efforts were so feeble that they were futile! What matters is that it was impossible to sit to wait for the horizon to draw near to me!

I also asked myself:

Does success only mean succeeding? Does it sometime not mean failure? Christopher Columbus did not succeed in his lifelong mission to reach India by travelling westward.

Was his life a failure?

I decided that success or failure depends on the way you define your standard of judgement. And so, I defined my standards of judgement, negatively and positively as follows:

My standard of judgement is not to win cases against the Law Society. ·

It is the satisfaction of my conscience, that I have done all that I could do, to obtain justice, under the adverse circumstances.

LAW SOCIETY MANAGER MR. MARK HONE.

Before the dispute between the Law Society and me had arisen, Manager Mark Hone, or his office, which comes to the same thing, held and maintained that, as a Senior English Barrister, I ought not to be asked to sit for any test, in order to become a solicitor. He maintained and recommended that all I should be required to do, was to practice law, for a given period of time, in an English Solicitor's office. Unfortunately, his recommendation was over-ruled.

And that was when Mark Hone showed that he did not have much of a backbone! He could not stand for what he held to be right! His threefold duty as the secretary to the exemption committee were:

- To draw the attention of the exemption committee, to both, the law and the practice governing exemption of English Barristers, to become English Solicitors.

- To ensure that the decision made by the exemption committee complied with the provision of both, the law and the practice.

- To complain to the authorities of the Law Society, where the decision made does not comply with the law and practice.

He did not complain or report to the Law Society, about the unlawful decision made in my case!

To make matters worse, he then allowed himself to be made to swear a false affidavit! His affidavit testified that I had not produced as much proof of knowledge as other English Barristers who were exempted! Yet, he knew very well that I had produced by far, much more proof of knowledge of Solicitors' Accounts than any of the exempted barristers!

It was thus clear to me, that as long as Mark Hone, enjoyed a shadow of power, exemptions of English Barristers to become solicitors will never be based on the law! Mark Hone is essentially, a superficial driveller, with a deceptively innocent appearance, that has raised him to the position that he now holds. That fact makes you feel a certain relenting towards him, in spite of the harm that he has done.

In the hand of hardened politician, like Lord Lester, Mark Hone was a poor pawn! He could have easily been sacrificed,

if he had dared refuse to perjure himself!

LEGAL ADVISER ANNE COLES:

The Law Society Legal Adviser, Mrs. Anne Coles, is, in some ways, an original. On occasion, she even displayed an engaging manner. The manner of tyrant Amin when he was about to order your execution.

She is also a person peculiarly liable to delusions of the imagination that she is above the law. Consequently, the depth of her malice has become unfathomable.

Her appointment to the top hierarchy of the Law Society Legal Department appeared to have had 2 opposite effect on her. On the one hand, confronted with several thousands of solicitors much more learned in law, and much more experienced in legal practice than she is, she felt like an inexperienced stripling, who, being conscious that she is not exactly the most suitable candidate for leadership, decides to throw her weight defiantly saying:

So what! What dare you do about it!

On the other hand, some small voice in her might have kept on assuring her, that she would never have got the job, if she had not deserved it.

To impress his colleagues, who were not exactly versed in

law, Coles assumed the role of a Trouble Shooter. In that capacity she was not content to being the Law Society Solicitor! She made herself the Law Society's lawyer, administrator, Clerk, Secretary, and Mrs. Know-all! She meddles and intermeddles in matters, which had nothing to do with her post! Nay, she held posts, which the law specifically forbids her from holding! She dictated and bulldozed her ways in all things! Her morbid directions became the law!

There is no greater plague than an official who is ever prying into the work of others, who is ever intruding her advice on others, who is so self-opinionated that she deceives herself that she can do better, the work belonging to others.

There is no pest like an ever-meddling official.

Mrs. Cole was that official.

Her meddling exhibited the kind of malice, that is, by far, much more detestable than that of a fly. A fly detects, with unerring instinct, a festering sore in an otherwise healthy body, and swoops upon it with unexcelled joy. Coles, with her innate instinct, attributes to her victim, the crime that she herself has committed, and, with devilish glee, punishes her victim for it!

Her logic, that makes her attribute her offences to others, is what Shakespeare calls a woman's reason:

"I think him so, because I think him so"!

You may ask:

How could such a lawyer has become the head of the legal department of the Law Society?

The answer may be found in the saying that in the world of the blind, a one-eye man is king. In the world of the Law Society, where most of the lawyers have no experience in legal practice, a person like Coles, may pass for an expert!

At least, in my case, she was so treated as the final legal authority. I was told that from thence, henceforth, she and she alone, would be handling my case. She wrote to me, informing me that she was the lawyer, handling, on behalf of the Law Society, my case against the Law Society. In that respect, she had retained Bindman & Co Solicitors. I had no quarrel with that. It was her duty to do so.

Thereafter, she embarked on a series of measures, which showed that, she did not have the faintest idea of the A B C of law! Indeed, it shows that she had no common sense either! I began to wonder whether common sense is all that common!

The following are the deliberate measures taken by Anne Coles to defeat the end of justice:

First, she wrote to me a letter in which she stated that she had appointed herself to be the Secretary to the quasi judicial committee, that was to determine my application for exemption. In short, she was to play 2 contradictory roles! On

the one hand, she was to be a partial solicitor in a case I brought against the Law Society. On the other hand, she was to be an impartial secretary in the application for my exemption! The Bible points out, that it is simple common sense, that none can serve both, God and the Devil! In law, such contradictory roles are not allowed on the ground of conflict of interest! Mrs. Coles had decided to be both, a party, and a judge in her own cause!

Second, Mrs. Coles also informed me that as Secretary to the exemption committee, she herself was to appoint persons who were to act as judges in my cause! In law, and in common sense, judges appointed by a bias person, cannot be seen as impartial. Indeed, Coles went ahead to appoint the most bias judges! In accordance with the dictates of Mrs. Coles, the judges unanimously held that the identical rules of legal practice, in Uganda and England, were neither identical nor similar!

Third, Coles devised a confrontational test in which I was to attend the committee meeting, and be cross-examined by the judges! The object of it all was for the judges to prove that I did not know the rules of account! On my part, I also would cross examine my judges, apparently to prove that I was more proficient in the rules of accounts, than the judges were! Not a single English Barrister has ever been subjected to that kind of test! I accordingly refused to be a party, to my own racial discrimination.

Fourth, Anne Coles deliberately abused the power of her

office by using confidential documents, which I submitted for my exemption, to move an application against me in the Industrial Tribunal!

Fifth, contrary to her duty as the Secretary to the quasi judicial body, she refused to disclose to me the policy which gives automatic exemption to English Barristers, who had practised law in the offices of solicitors for two years. The result was that I became the only English Barrister who has ever been refused exemption, after practising law in the offices of English Solicitors for well over two years!

As my friend put it:

Mrs Coles is a woman with a past: the past of a Judas who betrays the most sacred trust!

At all material time, Coles knew that she ought not to have done what she did. Again and again, I wrote to her letters, teaching her, the law. I pointed to her the law against judicial bias. The word bias:

"Denote a departure from a standard of even-handed justice which the law requires from those who occupy judicial office, or those who are commonly regarded as holding a quasi-judicial office. Such as an arbitrator. The reason for this clearly is that, having to adjudicate as between two or more parties, he must come to his

adjudication with an independent mind, without any inclination or bias towards one side or other in the dispute". (See: Lord Thankerton in Franklin and others v. Minister of Town and Country Planning: [1948] A. C. 87)

It was clear to me that to the Gang of Four, the issue was no longer one of justice. It was one of the ends justifying the means! The end was that, come what may, I was to be refused exemption. The sole means for doing so was for Anne Coles to ensure that the end of justice was defeated by manifest judicial bias! There was to be, no pretence, either that justice was being done, or that it was being seen as done!

The whole exercise was a gigantic double cross: a gigantic betrayal of the law of the country. Had William Shakespeare been alive today, he would have ably summed up Mrs. Anne Coles, as:

"A very honest woman, but something given to lie".

I was thus obliged to report this criminal conduct of Mrs. Coles to the press. And, Mrs. Coles was not amused. Just as a thief considers being caught, but not his theft, as a bad thing, so is a felon! Mrs Coles considered her efforts to defeat the end of justice as a good thing! She considered the press reporting of what she did, as a bad thing!

When she read my press report, she conspired with her colleagues in the Gang of Four, as well as with Solicitor Lewis and Lord Lester to give me notice of their intention to sue me for libel. They also gave me notice of their intention to

bring, in the High Court, committal proceedings, for contempt, against me!

She claimed that I should not have disclosed to the press, the documentary evidence that prove her felony! I told her to go ahead and bring contempt proceedings if she dared! She did not dare!

Instead, she conspired with the Bar Council, knowing that the Bar has no jurisdiction, to try me for contempt of court!

During the hearing of the case in the Inns of Court Tribunal, I subjected her to a short, but intense cross-examinations. Through her replies to my cross-examinations I succeeded to prove beyond any reasonable doubt that the Disciplinary Tribunal was a Kangaroo Court. And that Coles selected it because it was a Kangaroo Court. The transcript for her cross examination is given in the next chapter.

During her cross-examinations she made a couple of confessions which made her look sickly. Her face was pale. Her eyes hardly blinked. Like a frightened mouse, she kept looking at me from the side of her eyes! It was disquieting to see her so frightened of her confessed guilt! I wondered why she was so frightened! Clearly the bias judiciary and Legal System, would have already assured her of absolute immunity!

I looked at her. There was something worrying about her, seated on a chair, in the loneliness of the witness chair. She seems to be pleading:

"Are you asking me to incriminate myself? Do you want me to hold a candle to my shame?"

I instinctively decided to leave her alone.

After all I had made my point. It was clear to all that, at best, the complaint was by a self-confessed guilty party, for the punishment of a guilty party. At worst, the complaint was by a self-confessed guilty party, for the punishment of an innocent party! As a member of the audience put it:

This is a question of big rats, making small rats, the scapegoats in order to cover up their own offences.

The law is that he, who comes to equity, should come with clean hands. Here was Coles, confessing openly that she came to equity with dirty hands!

She had not the slightest legal justification for her unlawful publication of confidential documents. I had lawful justification for the publication of the same documents.

Yet here was I, being subjected to investigation and punishment!

There was she: neither subjected to investigation nor subjected to punishment!

Why? Because of the colour of her skin. And because of the colour of my skin!

There are no other reasons!

Anne Coles chose to use Inns of Court Tribunal for one and one reason only: to muzzle my lawful demand for the investigations of her criminal offences and the criminal offences of her colleagues!

Cole could count on the Bar behaving exactly as she wanted. The Bar is very unfortunate. Barristers depend exclusively on solicitors for their income! The Law Society controls solicitors. Through that control, it sometimes does, as in my case, tell the Bar to toe the line. And the Bar, just as the Legal Aid Board, and the Office for the Superintendent of Solicitors, has toed her line. The question is:

How long should they be allowed to continue to do so?

The Lord Chancellor is right. It is evil to allow barristers to depend for their livelihood, on the mercies, the so-called briefings, of solicitors. Barristers should, like solicitors, have a right of direct access to lay clients. Nor should solicitors run the Legal Aid Board. It should be the preserve of both, solicitors and barristers. Barristers, as consultants in law should be the Legal Aid Board adjudicators.

Cole is just a poor player. By a stroke of luck, she has strutted and fretted her way upon the Law Society stage. Soon, she will be remembered only in the way you remember a tale told by an idiot:

"full of sound and fury, signifying nothing".

Had she been a good player, she would have known when to

stop her open conspiracy to defeat the end of justice. There are sayings that:

- Too much of anything, is bad.

- Over-drumming, bursts even the biggest drum.

CHAPTER 5.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT LAWYERS:

THE CROSS-EXAMINATION OF MRS. COLES:

During a short but intense cross-examinations of Mrs. Coles, she made 3 very important confessions. It blew away the very basis of the case against me. Had the tribunal been independent and impartial, it would have, forthwith, dismissed the case against me:

First, she admitted that the sole complaint against me was that

I had revealed:

"Confidential information contrary to an order of the industrial court".

In short, that the complaint against me is contempt of court! Only the High Court has jurisdiction in such matters.

Secondly she admitted that she herself had unlawfully published the confidential or forbidden documents:

DR. ADOKO: And those, you did put in them, the forbidden document?

MRS. COLES: Yes. I did.

Thirdly, she confessed that the Law Society has the right to break the law for the purpose of achieving its required goal i.e. to the Law Society, the end justifies the means! Amongst others, the Law Society dared break the following laws:

1. The law that lays down the venue for the trial for contempt of court case!

2. The law that prevents Mrs. Coles from publishing confidential documents to unauthorised body.

3. The law pertaining to perjury! For the purpose of avoiding discovery, Coles deliberately swore a false oath about not knowing the names of solicitors who had been punished for

contempt of court. She knew the names as she had pleaded it before!

4. Like Mrs. Coles both Mark Hone and Anthony Lester had equally perjured themselves.

5. Then there was the unlawful suspension, by the Law Society of tie implementation of the law pertaining to exemption of English Barristers. And so on, and so forth!

In the infamous words of Mrs. Coles:

I believe that you are affixed with the same professional ethical duty with regard to confidentiality as the Law Society is, and that you would <u>not breach that further than was necessary to carry out your investigation!</u>

The following is the transcript of the cross-examination of Mrs. Coles:

DR. ADOKO: Mrs. Coles, you are the person who made the complaint to the PCC. Is that so?

MRS. COLES: I wrote to Mr. James, at the Bar Council. Yes.

DR. ADOKO: You complained against my conduct?

MRS. COLES: I did, yes.

DR. ADOKO: What was the essence of your complaint?

MRS. COLES: That you had revealed confidential information contrary to an order of the industrial court.

DR. ADOKO: By that, what do you understand? What kind of offence, in your mind, did I commit?

THE CHAIRMAN (as expected, intervenes to help Coles out!) Is that for her to answer? Is that not for us to decide? I do not want to stop you, Doctor. If you say that is a justifiable question I will not stop you. I just do not know to what issue it goes.

DR. ADOKO: I just asked the question because of the decision that you have made in order to find out from her whether in her own mind "

THE CHAIRMAN: She said that confidential material was revealed contrary to the direction of the Tribunal; I think that is the essence of the answer!

DR. ADOKO: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the essence of the complaint if a complaint was made. Is that not the answer to the question? I think you have your answer!

DR. ADOKO: You remember the order which you are referring to, the Tribunal's order?

MRS. COLES: Yes, I do. Yes.

DR. ADOKO: It prohibited you, that is the Law Society, and myself from making such disclosures, is that not so? Disclosures of what they regarded as confidential matters.

MRS. COLES: I was present at the preliminary hearing when the Chairman considered this, and to preserve the confidentiality of individual applicants, under the Qualified Lawyers Transfer Regulations, the Chairman ordered that the Law Society should delete such information as would identify these applicants, but that they would be given serial numbers in another way. That was purely to meet the Law Society's concern about confidentiality. Yes, I do remember that order.

DR. ADOKO: And that was done?

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I just interpose? The serial numbers, are they the reference numbers we see on the corner at the top?

MRS. COLES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Forgive me for interrupting you, Dr. Adoko. But, it seemed important to deal with it at the point when the witness has mentioned it.

DR. ADOKO (to Mrs. Coles): When you made your complaint, did you include those documents, which disclose the names (of the Applicants), to the PCC?

MRS. COLES: The initial letter enclosed, I believe, "Has the Law Society committed those Offences?" It included a

sample of documents. I cannot precisely recall which documents, although I do believe I sent the relevant ones and they are referred to in that letter.

DR. ADOKO: But, subsequently you submitted more bundle of documents.

MRS. COLES: Yes.

DR. ADOKO: And those, you did put in them, the forbidden document?

MRS. COLES: Yes. I did.

DR. ADOKO: Did you receive any comments from the Tribunal about that, from the PCC?

MRS. COLES: I did not.

DR. ADOKO: This one was made in connection with the race relations case, is it not, which I brought against the Law Society?

MRS. COLES: No. Your case has been considered on a number of occasions by the Pre-Strategy Group at the Law Society.

DR. ADOKO: Sorry. The question was: the order was made by the Tribunal in connection with the race relations case that I brought.

MRS. COLES: Yes, it was. Sorry. I misheard what you

said, Dr. Adoko.

DR. ADOKO: That is alright. The race relations complaint was that I had been treated differently from the White barristers of my experience, is that so?

MRS. COLES: I understand what your complaint was. Yes.

DR. ADOKO: When you sent this particular document, the document which you said was prohibited from publication, when you sent it to the PCC, they did not reply to you that you were actually disclosing a document which you should not have been disclosing to the PCC?

THE CHAIRMAN: She has answered that question because you asked it a moment ago! She said, "I did not receive any comments about those documents from the PCC".

DR. ADOKO: (Persistent). That is part (of the answer) Your Honour. But, I was not asking whether she received any comments. I am asking whether she herself did not have some qualms in sending it.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Did you have any qualms about sending these documents?

MRS. COLES: I believe that you are affixed with the same professional ethical duty with regard to confidentiality as the Law Society is, and that you would <u>not breach that further than was necessary to carry out your</u>

investigation!

DR. ADOKO: But, you had asked the Tribunal first, is that not right, before the Tribunal which has carried out this work, you had asked them, whether they could make the necessary investigation in my case, is it not?

MRS. COLES: We did ask the Industrial Tribunal and I believe that their reply was exhibited, "The Industrial Tribunal do not undertake these cases".

DR. ADOKO: They did not have any jurisdiction. Is that so?

MRS. COLES: I believe that they have not.

DR. ADOKO: And they told you that it was the High Court which had the jurisdiction. Is that so?

MRS. COLES: Yes.

DR. ADOKO: The PCC asked why you are not going to the High Court. Is it not?

MRS. COLES: I am not aware that they have asked that.

DR. ADOKO: You sent to them your affidavit. And you said, "At the moment we would not like to go to the High Court"!

MRS. COLES: We considered going to the High Court. But we decided not to.

DR. ADOKO: Yes. You preferred this particular Tribunal!

MRS. COLES: Yes.

DR. ADOKO: When you said that you considered that although you disclosed to them, they would not disclose it further than is necessary, that was your thinking. But, that is not what you have read from the law, is it?

MRS. COLES: (Evades the question}: Professional barristers and solicitors are bound by a professional code of ethics, which includes a requirement to observe confidentiality.

DR. ADOKO: Does it also include the requirement to abide by the law?

MRS. COLES. Yes, it does.

DR. ADOKO: Which means that if the law requires you to go to the High Court, you should go to the High Court?

MRS. COLES: The law does not require me to go to the High court!

DR. ADOKO: Where does it require you to go?

MRS. COLES: The Law Society has an option to go to the High Court. The Law Society is not required to go to the High Court.

DR. ADOKO: In the letter from the Tribunal it

specifically stated, does it not, that if you require to proceed with this matter, you should go to the High Court?

MRS. COLES: If the Law Society wished to proceed against you for contempt of court, it would be necessary to go to the High Court.

DR. ADOKO: So, you are not proceeding for contempt of court!

MRS. COLES: The Law Society has decided not to proceed against you for contempt of court!

DR. ADOKO: They decided to proceed against me for what?

MRS. COLES: The Law Society has decided to refer this matter to your professional body.

DR. ADOKO: Tell me something about contempt of court. You have other professionals who have committed this offence. Is it not?

MRS. COLES: I am sorry Dr. Adoko. I did not hear that.

DR. ADOKO: I received a letter from your solicitors which informed me that Honourable Harriet had committed this particular offence.

MRS. COLES (Since Justice Wright had denied me discovery of documents, Mrs. Coles was not going to

permit oral discovery either"!) I am sorry. But, I do not know that.

DR. ADOKO: You do not know?

MRS. COLES: No.

DR. ADOKO: Do you know of any person where there was a complaint of a breach of the order of the Court, in the Law Society?

MRS. COLES: I am not aware of any!

DR. ADOKO: I would have liked to ask you other questions. But the field here is very, very narrow and I think I will leave it at that),

FUNCTION:

His threefold function became:

1. To be, outside the Law Society, what Mrs. Cole was, inside the Law Society. He became the Law Society trouble-shooter, of the Mafia type! His specialisation was to twist or break the law, in order to explain away the Law Society's racist persecution!

2. To be, to Mrs. Coles, what Aaron was to Moses. He was to be the expositor of the newly acquired Law Society's brand of racism! He was to see to it that no court gave

relief to a nonentity, who dared challenge, the officials of the Law Society!

3. In that way, his duty was to teach, on behalf of the Law Society, the King Solomon's lesson, that none should dare oppose the mighty.

He carried out his new-found duties so effectively that, his words became a ruse, to betray the law!

LOVE OF A TRIFLER:

His alleged belief in human right for all, appeared like the love of a trifler. Or the talk of a parrot: shallow and meaningless! In his mouth, human right became a mere cant. It was what he said for effect. No sooner had he said it, repeated it, then he began to indulge in its violation!

A former Judge, Barrister, Mr. Justice Emmanuel Oteng, appealed to him, in the interest of justice, to consider the punishment already inflicted upon me by the Law Society, as enough for the purpose. Oteng appealed to him, to recommend to the Law Society that, in the circumstances, I be allowed to practise law as a solicitor.

STRAIN OF SADISM:

The answer given by Lord Lester to Mr. Justice Oteng's letter pre-eminently displays the strain of sadism in Lester. Lester was not concerned about the injustice that he had precipitated

against me! Only about my publication of what he did! He wanted to know, what I was going to do about the articles I published on him! In short, I was not to be allowed to practise law as a solicitor, unless I undertook to remove from my web site, the articles that I had published against Lord Lester!

His answer, in short, was the very definition of abuse of power!

It also proves that Lord Lester had sunk below the hisses of his conscience! His only consolation appeared to have become the hurrahs, and huzzas, of his hirers in the Law Society!

GIFT OF THE GAB:

Though Lord Lester regards my articles about him as a curse, yet, they are actually blessings in disguise. He needs, to know the truth about himself. So does the world. As Oliver Cromwell once put it:

Paint me as I am: wrinkles and all.

Before he had the luck to meet me, Lord Lester was said to boast about his Gift of the Gab. With that gift, he perceived that he could get away with any crime! In spite of his scanty knowledge of the law, the gift had made him a successful barrister! Above all, it made him an adept at covering up the type of person he is.

Then, he met me! Suddenly, his secret for success was exposed. He is a chameleon!

CHAMELEON NATURE:

Of course, he was bound to be exposed. If I did not expose him, another person would have done it. It was just a matter of time. Lester could deceive some of the people, some of the time. He could never deceive, all of the people, all of the time. Hence, he has only his chameleon nature to blame for its disclosures.

TURBID HOPE:

He may also blame, for the disclosures, his turbid hope to earn massive fees, by denying me my fundamental rights to practise law as a solicitor.

On the one hand, mercenary conduct caused me much worry. And, it prompted, in me, dark foreboding of a conspiracy to deprive me of my professional title, which I had worn, for over 30 years.

On the other hand, and this is really what is important, it armed me, with the inside knowledge of treasonable breaches of law, within the Law Society. In the course of my cases against the Law Society, massive documents were openly, or by way of discovery, disclosed to me! They proved to me beyond reasonable doubt, that some officials of the Law Society in conspiracy with some outstanding lawyers have been responsible for treasonable breaches of our laws. That knowledge became the weapon that I very much needed, to fight corruption within the judiciary and the legal system.

DEVIL INCARNATE:

Even my meeting, face to face, in the Industrial Tribunal, with Lord Lester, whose advice the Law Society claimed to have relied all along, was some sort of a weapon. His bulldozing the Chairman of the Tribunal, his asking for favours from the Chairman, his giving a gift to the Chairman of the Tribunal, his making an application that no sensible person would make, all proved how the Law Society had stooped to hire a Mafia type of a lawyer, as its counsel!

I have hitherto held many lawyers in absolute contempt. First amongst them now, is Lord Lester! Whatever he did appeared deliberately calculated to breed contempt of him! Clearly, he regarded himself as a very great man. And, clearly he was not amused that I appeared not to regard him as a great man! In that, he was mistaken. I regard him, in his own right, as a great man. But one cannot hear him, without feeling that, in his heart, he is a very wicked man. It cannot be gainsaid that wicked men such as Hitler, are also great men!

When I think of the intrigues, cruelties, persecutions which I have suffered, in the hands of Lord Lester, I am tended to say, that though Lord Lester may not be the devil incarnate, yet, he is not very different from the devil.

DWARFISH THIEF:

I fail to see why after 10 years of denying me legal practice as a solicitor, his fierce, besotted rage, has not been glutted by his success in reducing me to subsistence living!

I know why he continued to deny me legal practice as a solicitor! He himself has said that much. It is because of the unpleasant truth that I published about him! His confession describes him to a T. In the words of a popular verse:

"Now does he feel his title

Hang loose upon him, like a giant robe

Upon a dwarfish thief".

And, it is true that Lord Lester is, actually, a dwarfish thief. His title, noble Lord, does hang loosely upon him. Noble! Indeed! Robin Wood was a noble thief. He stole for the benefit of others. Lord Lester's legal representation of the Law Society, in a suit before Chairman Donnelly was, theft, but, for himself! He obtained public money, as legal fees, by falsely pretending to be giving advice on points of law, whereas, in fact, he was engaged to give advice, and he gave advice, on how the Law Society should break the law!

DWARF KILLER:

My legal battle with him, was not a fight between a Goliath and David. If it were, David would have won. It was a fight without any odds! The trial judge was bought and blackmailed! Lord Lester had threatened to take the dispute

between us for a trial before a British jury, who could not be bought and blackmailed. Did he do it? Of course not. The Law Society only appears before corrupt judges.

And, that is another attribute of Lord Lester. Where his reputation is concerned, he prefers not to fight against odds. He is not a Robin Hood. By instinct, he is a dwarf killer; not a giant killer. He resembles a bloodhound, which, chases a rabbit with all its might, but turns its tail and runs away, when it sees a rhino! More aptly, he is a hyena. His prowess is best exhibited, in fighting the fallen.

SUBORDINATION TO LEGAL ADVICE:

Lord Lester had played such a dominant role in the decision of the Law Society in my complaint of racial discrimination that, the sole defence that the Law Society advanced for failure to admit me was that:

They merely carried out their duty of subordination to legal advice!

According to the Law Society, they had not done anything, which their legal adviser had not advised them to do! They were not answerable for the justice of what they did! They were merely following advice! The principle which governed their acting on advice was indistinguishable from the principle which governed a soldier to obey an official order. Without obedience to order, soldiers become rabble! Without abiding

by legal advice, the Law Society becomes a mob!

The Law Society thus contended that the military discipline of obedience to order applies to them. A military commanding officer who gives the order to wipe out the population of a village, say in Kosovo, is alone responsible for the mass murder. Consequently, Lord Lester alone, not the Law Society is responsible for the consequences of his advice: the advice that it was lawful to deny me both my right to legal practice as well as to any compensation!

The Law Society argument is, of course, false. An advice is no order. It does not call for obedience.

Even if it were an order, which it is not, the fact is that the advice given, by the so-called Queen's Counsel, Lord Lester, were of such a nature that if the Law Society officials were persons of virtue, they would have opted to incur the heaviest penalty of disobedience, rather than enforce it.

Men of virtue shrink from obeying orders that manifestly violate human rights of others or openly violate the law of the country.

EXPIATION OF CRIMES:

In the circumstances, what then should happen to Lord Lester, whom the Law Society confess has acted, as its tool, in the violation of my rights, and the law? And what about the fortune paid to Lord Lester for breaking the law? The law is quite clear.

Lord Lester is like a commander who gives irresponsible order. He had to be punished with the utmost severity of the law. This most eloquent, most powerful lawyer should be subjected to a public trial, to expiate his crimes!

Yet, contrary to its duty to punish Lord Lester, the Bar refused, on a technicality, to entertain any complaint against him! They dare not say that the complaint was baseless! Only that, a person like me should fill a form, to initiate a complaint against a person Lord Lester! But, a person like Lord Lester need not fill a form, to initiate a complaint, against a person like me! And the Bar expected me to be a party to such manifest racial discrimination!

SUMMATION:

Briefly, the followings are some of the unlawful acts perpetrated by Lord Lester:

1. Concealing from me my entitlement to be exempted from doing any test to become a solicitor by virtue of my several years of legal practice as an English Barrister!

2. Giving me false information that I was not entitled to exemption from the test in order to become an English Solicitor!

3. Racial discrimination by directing me to sit for a test to become a solicitor whereas my colleagues, the White English

Barristers were being exempted without sitting for the test.

4. Contrary to the law and to the advice of Mr. Justice Brooke, I was racially discriminated against by the Law Society decision refusing to allow its race relations committee, to investigate my complaint of racial discrimination!

5. Giving me false information that I had not obtained marks required for exemption whereas I had scored much higher marks than that required for exemption.

6. Giving me false information that I had not given sufficient proof of knowledge of accounts, whereas I had given the most overwhelming proof compared to any English Barrister ever exempted!

7. Drawing up Written Guidelines for the sole purpose of refusing me exemption and using the newly drawn guidelines to refuse me exemption!

8. Refusing to consider my application for exemption on the ground that I had exercised my fundamental right to apply to the court for judicial review!

9. Contrary to the policy of the Law Society which makes it mandatory to exempt every English Barrister who has practised law in the offices of solicitors for 2 years, I was refused exemption when I had practised law in the offices of English solicitors for 2 years! I was still refused after I had practised law for 3 years! I remain the only English Barrister discriminated against in that way!

10. Refusing to exempt me on a deliberate falsehood that the rule of accounts that governed my practise abroad was not the same as that in England whereas they were identical and the Law Society knew it!

11. Withholding the information I need to get exempted, in spite of my request for it. The information withheld was that all that was required from me was a letter from a solicitor showing that I was conversant with the rules of account!

12. Asking solicitors to give the kind of testimonial that would lead to my being refused exemption because the testimonial would not contain the required information for exemption!

13. Lord Lester prepared a false affidavit to be sworn by Mark Hone for the purpose of misleading the High Court that I had not produced proof of knowledge of accounts sufficient to justify my exemption! In fact I had given more proof of knowledge than any exempted English Barrister!

14. Unlawful suspension of the implementation of the law governing exemption of English Barristers for the sole purpose of preventing me from being exempted!

15. Continued exemption of White English Barristers during the time that it was being falsely claimed that exemption of English Barristers had been suspended!

16. Then there was the delay of my exemption on the ground that time was necessary to draw new guidelines for exemption! At long last I was told that the new guideline for

exemption was to be known as individual merit! It meant continued discriminatory exemptions! It also meant continued refusal to implement the law which called for proof of knowledge of the subjects!

17. A confrontational oral test was drawn up for me and for me only for the purpose of refusing to exempt me!

18. Contrary to the rule of conflict of interest, Anne Coles, the solicitors defending the cases I had brought against the Law Society was made to act as the secretary to the quasi judicial committee that was to determine the issue of my exemption! She was there to ensure that I was refused exemption! And for the purpose of collecting information to be used against me, in a court of law. Indeed in breach of judicial confidentiality, she used the information I supplied to make application against me in the Industrial Tribunal!

19. Refusing to exempt me on the ground that the Law Society needed to commission an expert to explain to them the kind of the law that I practised in Uganda! It was merely an excuse to delay my exemption. They had a copy of the law. Besides I had already sent to them the opinion of Dr. Read on the said law. There was thus no point to commission the same Dr. Read to send the same opinion to them! After months of useless waiting, Dr. Read sent to the Law Society the opinion that I had already given to them! On receipt of that Opinion they promptly ignored it!

20. When the Law Society had run short of all excuses for refusing to exempt me, it treated me discriminatorily by

refusing to answer my letters and letters written on my behalf!

CHAPTER 6.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT LAWYERS:

LORD ANTHONY AS LORD CAMOUFLAGE!

Lester is not a man to be hated. He is not a man to be loved. He is a man to be despised.

CAMOUFLAGE:

In outward appearance, Lord Lester tries to be all things to all men! We called him Lord Camouflage. His habit of canting about human rights, his polite language, his humble carriage, his composed face, his artful suavity, had imposed on many people. Yet, they were merely camouflage. It made people believe that he was a Dr. Jekyll.

He is Mr. Hyde!

He is a person with a clean exterior. But, he has a dirty interior. When the body of a person is dirty, you can wash him. You can dress him in clean clothes. But, what can you do when his soul is dirty?

INDEFENSIBLE CONDUCT:

At all material time, Lord Lester knew that what the Law Society had done to me, was indefensible. They had discriminated against me on racial ground. He knew that his attempt to defend the Law Society for such a manifest act of racial discrimination was equally indefensible.

The advice that he gave to the Law Society, a few days before the case came for hearing before Chairman Donnelly reveals the depth of his rottenness. His advice was to the following effect:

We are unable to find out a single ground for refusing Dr. Adoko exemption to become a solicitor. We are unable to find out any flaw in his argument. He has the truth on his

side. We have the cunning. All the same, his accusation of racial discrimination, is proof that he has some sinister motive! Consequently, the safest way to treat with him is to deny him admission into the roll of solicitors. Or, at least, to delay it as long as possible. In the circumstances, my advice is simply this: we admit that we have discriminated against him! We deny intentional discrimination. Instead, we blame our guidelines for his discrimination. We hint to him in court that we will continue to discriminate against him on other grounds. And to add insult to injury, I will apply for his case for racial discrimination to be struck out!

JUDGEMENT OF FUTURE CASES:

Indeed, the sum total of his summing up in the Industrial Tribunal, was basically as summarised above! Except that he went much further than that! He told the Chairman of the Industrial Tribunal to write her judgement in such a way that, Lord Lester will be able to use it, in future, to dismiss the next case that I will be obliged to bring against the Law Society! He made it clear that he had already advised the Law Society, not to admit me as a solicitor, come what may! And in that way, I would be obliged to bring further cases against the Law Society for exemption and/or admission!

It goes without saying that the Chairman obliged him!

JONATHAN SWIFT:

When I was young, I had read Jonathan Swift's description of

lawyers. I took it then, as a joke. But, as Lord Lester continued to show off, before this poor lady Chairman, it occurred to me, that Jonathan Swift might have, without knowing it, been describing a barrister, very much like Lord Lester! In the word of Jonathan Swift:

"There was a society of men among us, bred from their youth in the art of proving, by word multiplied for the purpose, that white is black and black is white according to how they are paid".

Jonathan Swift describes the Lord Lester type of barrister well:

A hired Liar.

FOREWARNING AND FOREARMING:

When you come across such a desecrator of justice, you have a duty to forewarn, and hence, forearm others about him. In a few lightening sentences, this book describes, with unpretending simplicity, the truth about Lord Lester.

It warns every body not to be deceived by his crocodile tears about his sympathy with the underdogs, or with the racially persecuted. He is just one of those creeping things, that gloat in decay:

Lord Lester is a common barrator. He pretends to be fair to both the parties in a dispute, while in fact, he is inflaming the passion of both the parties! He does not care a hoot, what happens to the parties. His sole care is that

whatever happens, he is bound to enrich himself at their expense!

He thus succeeded in inflicting deep wounds between the Gang of Four of the Law Society, who had hired him, and me. The deep sores from those wounds fester. They will continue to bleed afresh till we die!

PERSONALITY STORM:

Lord Lester was, originally, not a party to the dispute. But, he succeeded to put himself in the midst of personality storm, which had convulsed the entire Law Society. He found himself obliged to ignore the advice of moderate men, such as, for instance, Mr. Justice Brooke! Mr. Justice Brooke had personally appealed to the Chairman of the Race Relations Committee of the Law Society to investigate my complaint of racial discrimination. He asked for no favours. He merely wanted my complaint investigated by the Committee, in the way that it investigated similar complaints. However, according to the Law Society, on the advice of Lord Lester, the request made by Mr. Justice Brooke was refused. All my applications to the Race Relations Committee of the Law Society, were never answered!

Had the Law Society carried out the duty of its office, as requested by Mr. Justice Brooke, the whole dispute would have been solved amicably. But, the Law Society refused to carry out its statutory duty. I was thus left with no alternative, but to seek redress, from some external body!

Lord Lester could not, even at that early stage, have failed to

see that the four officials, the so-called the Gang of Four, were not prepared to be restrained by any scruples, or to abide by any law, or to be scared by any danger inherent in breaking the law!

LESTER'S INTOXICATION:

In the face of such fanaticism, the duty of Lord Lester was to draw a line on the sand, and make it clear that he would not cross the line, beyond the sphere of the law. Instead, he made it clear that he was prepared to bend the law, to further their racism! In the course of doing so, he tasted naked racism. He had no loathing for it. He tasted it again and again. And he loved it. Racism became a second nature to him! Then a passion. And, finally, an intoxication.

Drunk with racism, Lord Lester betrayed his duty as a lawyer. He could no longer interpret the law honestly. As can be seen, from the chronology of events given above, and, summarised below, each and every advice he gave was fraudulent!

His Logic was not very different from that of Brutus. He was to be believed because of his honour. And, of course, we were to have respect to his honour, so that we may believe him! And what did his honour want us to believe? That any barrister who has worked in England and Wales for 8 years would know the solicitors' accounts and professional ethics? How? There was no answer to that! English Barristers who practised law in England never learnt Solicitors accounts! They never practised it! There was no way they could learn it! But Lord Lester claimed that those English Barristers would

know more about solicitors accounts than English Barristers whose legal practice abroad involved knowledge of solicitors accounts! And his sole basis for such a fantasy was his honour! No wonder that he has the honour of a Falstaff!

As the record shows, at no time did Lester ever hesitate to resort to evasions, fictions, falsehoods, doublings, and perfidy.

CHAPTER 7.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT LAWYERS:

SOLICITOR ROBIN LEWIS: MASTER OF BLACKMAIL

There are incidences, which create history. The nature of such incidences does not matter. It may be good. It may be bad.

The question is:

Why do they create history?

And the answer is:

Because they make revelations.

They sometimes reveal what is strange. More often, they reveal what is familiar.

BLACKMAIL:

Two letters from Solicitor Robin Lewis, made history. They revealed, beyond all disputes, that Solicitor Robin Lewis, is one of the worst blackmailers! He is a blackmailer of judges! He is thus, as anti-social, as a virus. The fact that he was able to blackmail judges by such secret letters, reveals the nature corruption within our judicial system.

As a result of his blackmail, the abhorrence with which I hold Solicitor Robin Lewis, the repugnance with which I shrink from his blackmail tactics, cannot be exceeded, had he been a mad dog!

Consequently, when it comes to serialise the attribute that Robin Lewis displays predominantly, in his legal practice as a solicitor, blackmail comes first and foremost! His blackmail, as Shakespeare would put it, has method in it. Lewis writes secret letters, in the name of the Law Society, to judges, demanding that the judges take certain courses of action, not in the interest of justice, but in the interest of the Law Society!

And he demands that the course be taken secretly, known only to Lewis and the judge, and never to the other party in the dispute! To make matters worse, the contemptible judges, or, more correctly, the corrupt judges servilely obey him!

GREED:

It is only to be expected, that a lawyer, who criminally stoops to obtain judgement by blackmail, is likely to be greedy! The second attribute that Robin Lewis predominantly displays in his legal practice, is thus greed.

His conduct reminds me of a case before a magistrate. An accused person had applied to the court, to be given time to raise money to pay the fees demanded by an advocate. Whereupon, the magistrate adjourned the hearing of the case. He asked the accused person, to see him in his chambers where the following discussion took place.

Magistrate: How much fee is your lawyer demanding?

Accused: 500.

Magistrate: How much have you for the purpose?

Accused: 200.

Magistrate: Well, give me that 200. It is enough to make you win the case!

Accused: I beg your pardon!

Magistrate: Your lawyer does not decide the case. I do.

Paying him, does not guarantee that you will win the case! Paying me, guarantees that you will win the case!

Exactly the same kind of discussion might have taken place between Solicitor Robin Lewis and the Law Society Legal Adviser Anne Coles. One thing is certain. Lewis succeeded to convince the Legal Adviser of the Law Society, Mrs. Anne Coles, that blackmail was much more effective than hiring barristers! Mrs. Coles herself has frequently dabbled in blackmailing judges of quasi-judicial bodies! In any case, she appeared to have agreed readily to a suggestion that the retainers given to all the 4 barristers, who were hired to represent the Law Society, in my cases against the Law Society, be terminated!

In that way, Robin Lewis became both, the solicitor and counsel for the Law Society! It is easy to imagine how he came to convince the Law Society to dispense with the services of the 4 Counsels:

Robin Lewis: How much fee is your Counsel demanding?

Law Society: 15,000.

Robin Lewis: How much have you for the purpose?

Law Society: 10,000.

Robin Lewis: Well, give me that 10,000. It is enough to

make you win the case!

Law Society: I beg your pardon!

Robin Lewis: Counsel does not decide the case. My blackmail does.

Paying Counsel does not guarantee that you will win the case! Paying me guarantees that you will win the case!

LEWIS' ATTEMPT TO BLACKMAIL ME:

Lewis' blackmail did not end on the judges only. He had, as shown above tried to blackmail me with threats of a libel suit, if I did not withdraw what I had written about him and others. He also tried to blackmail the Africa Centre i.e. if the African Centre allowed me to hold a press conference in their premises!

Invariably, the roar of a bully frightens the sparrows, and the children out of their wits. But not the adult. An adult is more likely to ask why the bully is roaring, instead of talking! The adult is bound to conclude, rightly, that, the object of the roar is to force him, to abandon whatever he was doing. In short, the bully saw whatever was being done as detrimental to his best interest!

That was exactly my conclusion from the futile attempt of Lewis to blackmail me. His false threat of bringing a suit against me was merely the roaring of the bully, to frighten the

sparrow. Lewis would never, never bring a case against me! The case would only publish his blackmail! It would be an act of self-incrimination!

A HOUND:

It was, because of his blackmail tactics, that Robin Lewis has been compared to a hound. Just as you can throw a bone to a hound, as a reward for having chased and bit open the throat of a deer, so has the Law Society thrown fees at Lewis, for having blackmailed judges!

Just as none respects the hound for what it has done, so does none respects Lewis, for what he has done! The Bible puts it:

What does it profit a man if he gains the whole world, and suffers the loss of his soul?

Hence, even those who made Lewis blackmail judges, could not fail to despise him for blackmailing judges! It is a question of what taste nice in the mouth, turning sour in digestion. As one person put it:

Lewis has been made to eat dust!

A VULTURE:

All along, the Law Society knew Lewis for the person he is: some sort of a vulture! And they treated him as a vulture i.e. a person devoid of conscience, but, with insatiable appetite, which they had to relieve, again and again, with food, in the

form of legal fees

A MANIA:

The third attribute that Solicitor Robin Lewis exhibits in his legal practice of Lewis is like that of Lord Lester. His legal practice appears as a mercenary not a professional organisation! It is impossible to estimate accurately the amount of public money that Robin Lewis plundered as fees for the unnecessary cases! And, therein hangs a tale:

Why did the Gang of Four of the Law Society allow Lewis to exploit the public purse so extravagantly and so endlessly! What was their motive! Was there any kickback!

The ill-gotten gain of Robin Lewis is estimated to run into a sizeable fraction of a million pound!

It is necessary to distinguish between his greed for money, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, his mercenary conduct in the way he tries to acquire money.

To Robin Lewis, greed for money has taken the form of a mania! It is his main addiction! It controlled him! It deformed his character!

His mercenary conduct lies in his method of acquiring money:

Robin Lewis sees it as his duty to acquire money by hook or by crook! When an option presents itself, he invariably opts to obtain legal fees by crook, rather than by hook!

The tumult of his spirit for money makes him morally irreclaimable. As the saying goes:

For money, he would sell his mother!

COSTS OF OVER £8000:

A copy of Robin Lewis letter of blackmail sent to Chairman Donnelly was accidentally disclosed. As intended, it effectively succeeded to defeat the end of justice. See Chapter 10.

Thereafter Robin Lewis effectively blackmailed Chairman David Booth, to have costs of over £8000 awarded against me! The law specifically provided that, not more than £150 could be awarded as costs in the circumstances! A rather involved detail of the blackmail is given in Chapter 13. I appealed against the illegal award to an equally corrupt judge, Mr. Justice Morrison! He dare not order me to pay the illegal cost of £8000.00! But he also dared not make a formal ruling that the order for the cost was illegal! Such is the characteristic of judgement by blackmail! Morrison was too scare of the, Robin Lewis, the Blackmailer, to point out that £8000.00 order for costs was illegal!

Distressed that I was not ordered to pay the illegal cost, the greed of Lewis could no longer contain itself! He now demanded that I be made to pay other costs, which the courts had specifically recommended, that I should not be made to pay! The Law Society itself had accepted the recommendations of the courts that it would not ask me to pay those costs! In any case, the period of limitation for obtaining

execution orders for those costs had long passed! But, Lewis, the Blackmailer, was not discouraged. He knew that he could blackmail his way through! And he did! He succeeded to have the orders for the execution of those costs unlawfully made!

The Supreme Court indeed! It has become the Supreme Blackmail!

No wonder that boundless corruption was laid to Lewis' charge. After the conference I organised to discuss the conduct of Lord Lester, Robin Lewis and the Law Society's Gang of Four, many commented on the conduct of Lewis. One person was so shocked by the conduct of Lewis that he attached to Lewis, the opprobrious name of:

The Law Society's Pilferer.

And there is certainly no question that there was enough ground to justify such a name.

AFFECTATION:

The legal practice of Robin Lewis exhibited alarming contradictions. And that brings us to the fourth attribute of Robin Lewis in his legal practice. It is the attribute of affectation! The memory of Robin Lewis is adept at twisting facts, to suit his convenience. His lips utter passions, alien to his heart! From such symptoms, the disease that his legal practice suffers from was thus diagnosed as affectation.

Throughout his legal representation of the Law Society, Solicitor Robin Lewis acted the part of the power of darkness

referred to in Macbeth. As an instrument of darkness and blackmail, he tempted the law Society with successes in minor matters, only to let the Law Society down, in matters of the utmost importance! Those are, the ultimate values of truth, human brotherhood and justice!

PREJUDICE:

The fourth attribute displayed by Robin Lewis in his legal practice is to capitalise on the prejudices of the judges. In order to arouse the male chauvinism of Mr. Justice Morrison, Robin Lewis resorted to arguments about sex! He quoted my criticism of Mrs. Anne Coles, in her capacity as the Law Society's Advisor! Then, suddenly he asked the judge:

Why should Dr. Adoko say such a thing about someone's wife!

The case had nothing to do with any person's wife! It was about an official of the Law Society. Sex was immaterial. But Lewis wanted to capitalise on class reaction that is provoked when colour collides with sex! Commented a person in the audience:

What then does sex equality mean, if the offences committed by a female officer is not to be disclosed, because she is some body's wife!

Another classical example of Lewis trying to capitalise on prejudice was his references to my strong criticisms of senior officials, who merely happened to be White! Lewis knew that they were criticised, not because they were White! But, he

was determined to appeal to the emotion of judges, not to their reason!

On my part, I was not prepared to apologise for the appropriateness of the language I used to describe the officials who abuse power. And, I never did. I assumed that the judges would know that extreme measures call for extreme language. Moderate language, in such cases, is, of necessity, inaccurate. Is it not more accurate, to say that a person has died, rather than that he has gone West? Is it not more appropriate to call a spade, a spade, rather than an agricultural implement? Or to call a thief, a thief, rather than a pilferer!

In the same way, it is much more accurate to describe Robin Lewis, for instance, as a mercenary, rather than as a lover of money. I can easily prove in court, that he is a mercenary! Though I may not prove whether his being a mercenary is due to emotional love of money or to rational need of money!

LAW OF DEFAMATION:

In the law of defamation, any comment, which uses a strong language, is accepted as fair, provided that it fulfils two conditions.

First, it is based on facts.

Second, it is not based on facts as such, but is sufficiently supported by fact that warrants its being made.

As a lawyer, I always ensure that every comment that I make, is based on fact, or is supported by fact, sufficient to warrant

me to make it. And that is the sole explanation why, up to now, Lord Lester, Robin Lewis, John Rendall, Nicholas Saunders, Mark Hone and Anne Coles were forced to eat their words! They had tried to blackmail me, with false threats that they would bring a libel suit, against me, in the High Court! They did not!

And that is why corrupt judges whose nature of corruption is published here will never dream of giving the jury the opportunity to determine the issue of their reputation!

SHIFTING RESPONSIBILITY:

The sixth and the last characteristic of the Robin Lewis legal practise is to shift responsibility for the damages that he has caused me to suffer, from his own shoulders to my shoulders! Whenever he appeared in the case, he made it a point to tell the judge that:

Dr. Adoko's misfortune is of his own making!

To him, it served me right to have been severely punished by the Law Society. As he saw it, I had no business, as an applicant to be a solicitor, to attack the racial policy of the Law Society! Worse still, to publish confidential proof of abuse of power by the Law Society officials!

When I think of him, I remember what King Solomon, in his great wisdom once said, namely, that a:

"Stone is heavy, and the sand weighty but a fool's wrath is

weightier than both".

Lewis' attack on me for fighting for my fundamental right, is, indeed, a fool's wrath. No wonder it is heavier than stone and sand! It is proof of his devilish delight, in the misery of a fellow human being!

MORAL STIGMA:

In a book of this kind it is my duty, as its author, to try to give an accurate moral atmosphere and mental scenery of my subject. In this case, the subject is Robin Lewis. It is not my duty to be pleasant. It is not a book of praise. Nor is it my duty to be unpleasant. It is not a caricature. My duty is simply to state the facts about the subject, and to make fair comments on the facts stated.

Judged solely from those criteria, the only conclusion was that Robin Lewis, morally stinks.

Of course, it is true that he was offended, and, indeed, haunted by the success of my publishing the truth about his misconduct. He had cause to emulate the tactics of a Roman senator, senior Cato, who ended his speeches with the words:

Such are my views and let Carthage be destroyed.

In the case of Robin Lewis, his ending invariably was:

Dr. Adoko has only himself to blame, for not being a solicitor!

But, even then, as a lawyer, he should know that punishment should have an end. As my punishment had gone on for some 10 years and shows no sign of being ended, perhaps he ought now to say:

The Law Society had only itself to blame for not ending the punishment betimes!

In the olden days of the Arabian Night Stories, it was in order for he Wanton Enchantress of the Arabian Night Tales to punish her lovers after the 40 days and 40 nights of enchantment i.e. by condemning them to the most terrible and endless penance! But in these days, when the European Convention protects the rights and freedom of all persons, the arbitrary, endless, archaic punishment indulged in by the Law Society, is not acceptable.

Hence, the fact that the Law Society failed to give me at least some hopes, to look forward to a given day, when I would be admitted to practise law as a solicitor, led irresistibly to conflict.

On its part, the Law Society had to keep hunting for a person so insensitive to the dictate of law and morals, who would stop me from practising, law. The question became:

Who is going to bell the Cat?

One officer after the other had tried it: Saunders, Hone, Coles, Lester, Lewis and, of course, the most just firm of solicitors, Crockers, Oswald Dickson Solicitors and a host of others,

were called upon to try to do so!

Being perfect gentlemen, Crockers Oswald Dickson settled the case out of court. The rest of them got their fingers burnt, and bolted away. Every time the unlawful means used is exposed, he who had offered to bell the cat had a second thought! Only Robin Lewis, a man without honour, remained longest! He had good reasons. Greed. But, even Lewis, towards the end of it all, felt obliged to bring in Masters Solicitors, to try to bell the cat. But he still remained in the background, although occasionally he surfaced! So I found myself receiving letters from two very different firms of solicitors, both purporting to represent the Law Society, in the same application for cost!

THE CATERPILLAR OF THE LAW SOCIETY!

To conclude, the conduct of Robin Lewis was insupportable. He wrote secret letters to judges. Those letters were a conspiracy to defeat the end of justice. They succeeded beyond all expectations! They mercilessly defeated the end of justice! They effectively introduced, within our judicial system, the Mafia Justice.

This wretch of a lawyer, who is regarded as despicable, even by the most moderate lawyers, protracted cases endlessly, for the purpose of what is called in legal terminology: Milking legal fees! Even when both, the Bar, and Inns of Court, had agreed in writing, that the interest of justice had dictated that, enough was enough, litigation must come to an end, he still continued with unnecessary litigation! His sole object was, of

course, to milk more fees from the Law Society!

In some ways, his conduct is comparable to that of the Royal Leeches during the reign of King Richard II. Shakespeare had the most appropriate name for them. He called them: Caterpillars of the Commonwealth! How that name suits Robin Lewis:

The Caterpillar of the Law Society!

Just as the populace was driven to rebel against King Richard II, so will the Conspiracy to Defeat the End of Justice, by this Caterpillar of the Law Society, cause many people to lose confidence in our judiciary. This book is a small proof, auguring a giant proof of justified disaffection.

CHAPTER 8.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT JUDGES:

CHAIRMAN E R DONNELLY: JUDGEMENT BY FEAR.

On 31 October 1994 the case that I had brought against the Law Society, for racial discrimination, came for hearing before Industrial Tribunal Chairman, Solicitor E R Donnelly. She turned out to be the most timid judge I ever knew. To make matters worse, she was susceptible to blackmail. Throughout the hearing she behaved as if she was not a judge, but a Stooge of Lord Lester. So, I called her Donnelly, the Stooge.

CONDITIONS OF REPRESENTATION:

I did not go to the hearing on 31/10/94. Counsel, Mr. Mitchel Aslangul, represented me. At first, he declined to represent me. He had not been given adequate time to prepare the case. He had only a faint idea of what the case was about. However, he agreed to represent me when his instructions, reduced the scope of his representation, to the following 4 points:

1. To apply to the Industrial Tribunal, on the basis of the Law Society admission of indirect racial discrimination against me, for an order that, I had been indirectly discriminated against, by the Law Society.

2. To withdraw the application for direct racial discrimination

on the ground that it had been rendered unnecessary by the admission of indirect racial discrimination, by the Law Society.

3. To explain to the Industrial Tribunal that I was not able to attend the hearing because of the sickness of my mother. I had been informed that she was dying. My brothers and sisters were by her bedside.

4. To explain to the Industrial Tribunal that as his sphere of his legal representation, was limited to the 3 points only, he would not be able to represent me on matters that fall without that sphere.

DECISION NOT TO ATTEND THE COURT:

The question of attending the court when my mother was dying could not arise. To me, mother-child relationship constitutes the innermost shrine of human relationship. Naturally, when I learnt that she was dying, I felt, though healthy, yet, very sick. The sickness of worries proved to be far worse than bodily ailment.

The fragile person of my mother, Imat Loi Awat Adoko, has, from my youth, filled me with silent amazement. I have never ceased to wonder how it was that the bond of motherhood should capture the heart of an offspring, in such endless meshes of pleasure and mysteries! Whenever I was in difficulty, the consolatory words of my mother, melted into

sweet harmony, all the bitterness in me! Whenever she asked me to render any service, my heart was always filled with pride, to be of service to her. Her purity and generosity made me pray to God to make me worthy of her love. It was natural that I continue to treasure the utter simplicity of mother-son relationship that she established with me. It was natural that, in the circumstances, I was unable to not attend the tribunal hearing.

COUNSEL APPLIES TO WITHDRAW:

As soon as the hearing opened, Counsel Aslangul applied to the court in accordance with the instructions given to him.

Lord Lester Q.C., Counsel for the Law Society, then moved that my case be struck out with costs because my conduct had been unreasonable. He claimed that I had continued to amend my statements of claim till just a few days before the case came for hearing! Lord Lester made it clear that his oral submission on his application for striking out my case, might take a whole day!

In the circumstances, Chairman Donnelly ruled that she would make her decision, with regard to the applications made on my behalf, after hearing Lord Lester Q.C.

Whereupon my Counsel, Mr. Michel Aslangul, applied to the court to be given permission to leave the court on two

grounds:

1. He had already carried out the instructions given to him.

2. He has no locus standi to represent me on the issue raised by Lord Lester i.e. on the way I had pleaded my case.

UNLAWFUL INSTRUCTIONS BY CHAIRMAN DONNELLY:

Chairman Donnelly then made her first blunder in law. She refused permission for my Counsel to withdraw! In law, she thus instructed counsel to represent me, against my will, and against the will of Counsel! She had no locus standi to do that!

Counsel found himself in a dilemma. In accordance with the professional ethics of the Bar, he had to abide specifically by the instructions that he had received from my solicitors. Further, he had to abide by the order of the court. The question that arose was:

How could he abide by my solicitor's instructions and the court order, when they were contradictory? Counsel was thus obliged to consider the alternatives available to him:

1. He could not obey both directions, as obeying either one of the two, resulted in disobeying the remaining one.

2. Nor could he obey one of the directions, as such obedience also resulted in disobeying the remaining direction.

3. The third alternative was to find a compromise formulae, which would resolve the dilemma.

He found the compromise formulae that resolved the dilemma thus:

· In accordance with the order of the Chairman, he would remain in court.

· And, in accordance with his instructions, he would not say a word on the application moved by Lord Lester.

The sum total of the decision of Chairman Donnelly was that Counsel, instructed by her, had to be in court, purporting to represent me, whereas in fact, Counsel was not representing me!

The question is:

Why did Chairman Donnelly attach so much importance on the false appearance?

The answer is:

Because she wanted justice not to be done, but to appear to be done!

FEAR OF LORD LESTER:

As a solicitor, and Chairman of the Industrial Tribunal, Ms. Donnelly knew very well that the application for a pre-hearing review, made by Lord Lester Q.C. was incompetent in law. It did not comply with the provision of Regulations 7(1) and 7(3) of the Industrial Tribunals. The law provides that:

"A pre-hearing review shall not take place unless the Secretary has sent notice to the parties giving them an opportunity to submit representations in writing and to advance oral argument at the review if they so wish".

In spite of the provision of that clear law, Lord Lester wasted a whole day moving, at public expense, his futile application! At the end of his long tale, Chairman Donnelly ordered that I attend the hearing of the Tribunal the next day to give an answer to the application made by Lord Lester.

I attended the hearing on 01/11/94. It was clear to me, that there was some sort of a conspiracy to defeat justice. I could not see how a learned counsel and a learned Chairman could have wasted time on what was, in law, clearly a baseless application! My answer took less than 8 minutes. It was to the following effect:

This is not a guerrilla court! Yet, it appears to have been conducted as if it were a guerrilla court! Lord Lester has introduced in it, the guerrilla tactics of ambushing the innocent! I find myself legally ambushed by Lord Lester's application! He has never disclosed to me that he was going to make a pre-review application for a hearing! He has never

disclosed to me the nature or particulars of the points of fact or law that he intended to raise! He has succeeded, as he had planned, to take me by surprise!

But, I will not be a prey of his legal ambush! I will not deal with the points raised by him in his application. I will not argue the point as to whether my amendments of pleadings amount to or do not amount to unreasonable conduct warranting striking out my pleadings. Nor will I argue the point as to why the Law Society's amendment of pleading, admitting racial discrimination, is considered reasonable and my amendment of pleadings, in response to their amendment, is considered unreasonable!

I will, instead, deal with the points of law that Lord Lester's surprise legal ambush, raise.

In law, all applications, which are so outrageous in their defiance of logic or accepted moral standards, are said to fall within the Wednesbury unreasonableness. In law, all such applications are incompetent. Lord Lester's application fell within that category. I pointed it out thus:

Lord Lester's application is contrary to the regulations of this tribunal. It is contrary to the rule of natural justice. And, it is contrary to the precedent of fairness. Lester knows it. The Tribunal knows it!

The first object of Lord Lester's application is that my case for indirect racial discrimination be struck out. Yet, that case is admitted by the Law Society as true. The law provides that I am entitled to judgement, in my favour, because of that

admission. How then, can the case be struck out?

The second object of Lord Lester's application is that my case for direct racial discrimination be struck out. I have withdrawn that case. How then, can a case, that is already withdrawn, be struck out?

LORD LESTER'S APPLICATION DISMISSED:

There was a brief adjournment. Thereafter, the tribunal ordered that the application made by Lord Lester be dismissed. It upheld my contention that it was unreasonable to dismiss my case, when the Law Society itself, had admitted that it had discriminated against me on racial ground.

COSTS AWARDED TO LORD LESTER!

In law, costs generally follow the events. The winner is awarded costs. The loser is condemned to pay costs. I was the winner. Lord Lester was the loser. Yet, the Chairman ordered me to pay one day cost for hearing the application to Lord Lester! The justification for the order was that, my amended case, had pleaded the issue of marks which had not been pleaded before! In fact, the issue of marks had been pleaded right from the beginning of the case! The sole purpose of ordering me to pay the costs was to save the face of Lord

Lester! It was to give the impression that Lord Lester's application was not as irrational, as it was!

DECISION TO HEAR THE CASE ON ITS MERIT:

Although the Chairman had undertaken to make a ruling my application to withdraw the case for racial discrimination and for judgement for indirect racial discrimination after disposing of the application made by Lord Lester, yet, she did not abide by that undertaking! After dismissing the application made by Lord Lester, she directed that my application for racial discrimination be heard on its merit!

Contrary to the legal requirement that he who alleges, proves, I was not requested to prove my case. I would have declined to do so. I had already withdrawn the case.

Instead, Lord Lester was asked to disprove my case! Lord Lester called the Law Society Director, Mr. John Rendall, as his first witness!

John Rendall's witness statement was read. It outlined the Law Society equal opportunity policies. It confirmed strict adherence to them. He then testified that I had not been intentionally discriminated against on racial grounds. The Law Society had merely been misled by its guidelines for exemption of English Barristers which made proof of locality of legal practice, instead of proof of knowledge of legal

practice, the criterion for exemption.

All the same, the Law Society was going all the way out to obtain from legal professional bodies in different countries, more information about the rules and nature of their legal practice. In cases where sufficient information had been obtained, the Law Society had made mutual arrangements with the Law Society in those countries. The Law Society gives automatic exemptions to the legal practitioners from those countries who seek to practice law in England.

Since the testimony of John Rendall blamed the guidelines as the cause for my indirect discrimination, it was necessary that I should expose the sole defence, based on the guideline, for what it was, fraudulent! And that I should expose Rendall, for whom he is, a Perjurer.

JOHN RENDALL'S PERJURY:

And, so, I began to cross-examine Rendall along this line:

Q: Mr. Rendall, when was the guidelines written?

A: It has always been there.

Q: Mr. Rendall, my question is a very simple one. When was the guidelines written?

A: I have answered it. It has always been there.

Q: Was it not written in April 1993?

(No answer}

Q: Was it not written as a defence to my complaint for racial discrimination?

A: It has always been there.

Q: Mr. Rendall, my question is not about the length of time it has been there. It is simply about the day, date, and year when the guideline was written. Can you deny that it was written in April 1993? Can you deny that it was written just before my appeal for racial discrimination was due to be heard on 09/04/93?

CHAIRMAN EXPOSES HER JUDICIAL BIAS:

Chairman Donnelly then intervened to say that my question had been answered! The witness had said that the policy had always been there! She then added, rather ominously that I had not fulfilled the favourable impression she had expected of me!

The purpose of her intervention was of course clear. To save John Rendall from answering the question about the date on which the guidelines was written. She knew that once that question was answered, then the defence that my discrimination was not intentional would collapse. And she

dare not let Lord Lester lose all the 3 cases:

1. Lester's application.

2. The case for indirect racial discrimination.

3. And the case for direct racial discrimination!

The Chairman then addressed my Counsel, Mr. Emmanuel Oteng, who was seated by me, and was advising me. She said:

Mr. Oteng, would you like to have a brief conference with your client? You may like to advise him about the possibility of his withdrawing his application for direct racial discrimination. It would save us all, a lot of time!

Oteng agreed. The hearing was adjourned for a few minutes.

I told Counsel thus:

I can see the way the wind is blowing. The Chairman had refused my original application for direct racial discrimination, because she expected to dismiss it on its merit. Now she sees that, if the case is heard on its merit, I will win it. Hence her change of mind that I should apply again, as if I had not applied before, to withdraw the case for direct racial discrimination!

Whereupon Counsel advised me, to continue to prosecute the case.

But I told him that I was simply not in the mood to prosecute the case. My mother was dying. My soul was with her. My

body was in the tribunal. Just the fact that I was in the Tribunal, prosecuting a case, when my mother was dying, filled me with guilt.

We agreed that I oblige the Chairman by withdrawing the case.

When the hearing resumed, Counsel informed Chairman Donnelly that I had agreed to withdraw the case. And I formally withdrew the case for direct racial discrimination.

LORD LESTER'S HIDDEN AGENDA:

During his summing up, the attributes that exhibit Lord lester as a legal monster, more appropriately, a fraudster, displayed themselves predominantly:

Lord Lester sought to justify the Law Society's guidelines as based on experience. He claimed that most of the English Barristers who have practised law in England and Wales, had fairly good knowledge of solicitors accounts and professional conduct! Of course the allegation was false. And Lord Lester knew it. Applications from such English Barristers clearly stated that they did not know the 2 subjects. How, indeed, could they? Neither their training, nor their legal practice, had anything to do with the 2 subjects. Yet, Lester considered such a fib necessary!

Lester informed the tribunal that, knowing the kind of person

that I was, the case would not bring to an end, the dispute between the Law Society and me. He therefore appealed to the Chairman to write the judgement in such a comprehensive way, that the Law Society may use it in future cases! He was asking the Chairman to write the judgement in such a way that the issue of direct racial discrimination, appears to have been determined on its merit, whereas it was not! It is only such a judgement, which lawyers call res judicata, could be so used!

He informed the tribunal that the enforcement of the law for the exemption of English Barristers has been indefinitely postponed! In short, the law was not to be implemented because if implemented, I would be exempted!

The Law Society had taken into courts several wooden stands for keeping files. They exceeded 10 in number. At the request of the Chairman, Lord Lester magnanimously presented them to the Tribunal. He told the Chairman that after we had left the court, she could arrange for the wooden stands to be collected by the court! Lester knew well, that that kind of conduct was known as judicial corruption.

CHAIRMAN MAKES AN ORDER:

The Chairman asked Lord Lester whether he agreed for an order to be made, with the consent of the parties, that my application for direct racial discrimination is withdrawn. Lord Lester agreed. She accordingly ordered that my case for racial discrimination was withdrawn. She promised to prepare a

written determination and promulgate it later.

LETTER OF BLACKMAIL:

On 22/02/1995, Solicitor Robin Lewis sent a secret letter to the Chairman of the Industrial Tribunal stating: "Our Client has asked me to write to you to enquire about the order which was made by consent on settlement of this matter on Wednesday November 2nd. Our Client are concerned to receive the Order, because of continued correspondence and negotiation with Dr. Adoko. In asking us to write direct to you, our clients instruct us to make clear that they do not in any sense wish to express any criticism of the manner in which the case was dealt by the particular Chairman, who conducted a difficult case with considerable patience and sympathy".

It is important to note the following points of law that the letter raises:

It was a secret letter. A copy was not given to me. Nor was a copy supposed to be disclosed to me. It was thus contrary to the rule of natural justice. The letter was written to the main Chairman of the Tribunal with the intention that it should be passed, by the main Chairman, to Chairman Donnelly! In short the letter was blackmail.

The reason for writing the letter, namely that the order was

required to assist the Law Society, in its

"Negotiation with Dr. Adoko"

was not true! The Law Society never intended to admit me, as a solicitor. It was merely looking for excuses, for not admitting me, as a solicitor. In any case, the order was given in an open court. Both parties knew its content! The fact that a false excuse was given, confirms that the main object of the letter was blackmail.

It was no accident that the secret letter of Solicitor Robin Lewis used universally recognised blackmailing "stick and carrot" tactics! First, all blackmailers use the "stick" tactics! They threaten their victims that the worst will happen to the victims if the victims fail to comply with demands. Second, all blackmailers use "carrot" tactics. They assure their victims that if the victims comply with the demands, the victims would be allowed to enjoy, uninterrupted, the pleasures of life! The Lewis "stick" tactic was stated thus:

"In asking us to write direct to you, our Client instruct us to make clear that they do not in any sense wish to express any criticism of the manner in which the case was dealt with by the particular Chairman"!

By those words, Chairman Donnelly was warned, in no uncertain terms, that the Law Society, who are her professional bosses, "reserved its right to express criticism of the manner in which" she deals with the case!

Robin Lewis' "carrot" tactics was expressed by a pat on the

back of Chairman Donnelly! As Lewis put it: Chairman Donnelly had:

"Conducted a difficult case with considerable patience and sympathy"!

THE CHAIRMAN IS BLACKMAILED:

Poor Chairman Donnelly! The blackmail was too much for her. She was obliged to change the judgement that she had given in an open court!

1. In the open court, she had ordered that the application made by Lord Lester, was dismissed. The judgement omitted to state that the application made by Lord Lester was dismissed!

2. In the open court, she had ordered that my application for racial discrimination had been withdrawn, with the consent of the parties. In the judgement, she wrote that my application for direct racial discrimination was dismissed!

By changing the word "Withdrawn" to the word "Dismissed", she killed 2 birds with one stone:

She provided the Law Society with a defence (of res judicata), as asked by Lord Lester, for any future case that I was sure to bring and which I subsequently brought!

She also complied with the demand in the letter of blackmail,

by strengthening the hands of the Law Society, in their "negotiation with Dr. Adoko".

APPEALS:

It goes without saying that I appealed to the Employment Appeal Tribunal, against the decision of Chairman Donnelly.

The Appeal turned out to be a waste of time. Had I known the nature of the corruption within our court system, as I now do, I would not have entertained so much hope.

In my appeal I raised all the errors of law enumerated above. There were, in all, 17 grounds of appeal. On 04 December 1995, Mr. Justice Mummery refused leave to appeal. He simply ignored all the 17 grounds of appeal. He held that, there was no ground for me to appeal because:

- I won the case on the issue of indirect racial discrimination.

- I withdrew my case for direct racial discrimination.

- The Law Society had undertaken not to enforce the cost awarded to it!

In the words of Mr. Justice Mummery:

"In those circumstances, so far as we can see, no useful purpose would be served by entertaining an appeal from a

decision which was in substance, won by Dr. Adoko".

It appeared to me that the grounds given, for refusing me leave to appeal, was a manifest error of law. The winning and losing of a case matters. But much more important than them, is the need for the court to ensure that the requirement of due process has been complied with. Hence, to refuse to determine the issues of blackmail and corruption, which are due process issues, appeared to me to disregard the raison d'être of the courts of law .

SECRET BRIEFINGS:

Then the truth came out! I was refused leave to appeal on the ground of a secret briefings! This is how Mr. Justice Mummery himself puts it:

"The Tribunal has been supplied with a full statement of the comments of the Chairman on these complaints (i.e. on my 17 grounds of appeal). Those are contained in the letters addressed to the Appeal Tribunal, dated 1 December 1995. We had considered in the Notice of Appeal and the Skeleton Arguments, accompanying documents and the response to those from theChairman of the Industrial Tribunal... We are satisfied that there is no error of law arguable on an appeal in this Tribunal"!

My appeal was thus determined on the strength of secret briefings the content of which remains a secret to me up to

now! That is the extent to which our courts do stoop to defeat justice!

The point of law with regard to such determination is quite clear. As Lord Hewart C.J. put it:

It is not merely of some importance, but it is of fundamental importance that justice should not only be done but should manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done: Lord Hewart C.J. in Rex v. Sussex Justices [1924] 1 K.B. 256, 259.

Justice cannot be seen to be done when judge refuses leave to appeal on the basis of some secret briefings not known to the appellant. As Mann J. puts it:

When a tribunal decides to proceed on the basis of some point which has not been advanced before it by a party, the person whose case is being considered by the tribunal, and any other person represented at the hearing or enquiry, should be alerted to the possibility of the tribunal taking the point concerned into account, so that all those affected by the decision have the opportunity to put forward any material which might persuade the tribunal differently on the point: R v. Mental Health Tribunal ex parte Clatworth [1958] 3 All E.R. 699 per Mann J at page 704.

FURTHER APPEAL:

I therefore decided to appeal to the Court of Appeal. On 07/03/97 the appeal came for hearing before Lord Justice Waite and Lord Justice Phillips.

IGNORING SECRET BRIEFINGS:

Surprise, surprise, the issue of secret briefings was not dealt with at all! Yet, that was the issue which, in law, determines whether a court is a Kangaroo Court, or a Court of law! But, both the Lord Justices appeared to have considered it such a normal way of administering justice, that it called for no ruling at all!

As lawyers would put it: that is the issue!

As Shakespeare would put it: therein hangs a tale!

RULING ON BLACKMAIL:

Their Lordships did, however, consider the issue of blackmail. Their findings were definite:

- That it took place.

- That it was wrong.

- But that they would not comment on it!

This is how they put it:

"Whether it is appropriate for solicitors to express any plaudits to the general chairman as to the manner in which the particular chairman conducted a difficult case, I make no comment"!

The question is:

What are the consequences of the failure of the Lord Justices to make comments, in accordance with their duty as judges?

The answer is that, the end of justice has been defeated. Had they made the comments, two things would have happened:

· The trial would have been held as a nullity.

· Solicitor Robin Lewis would have been referred to the Office for the Supervision of Solicitors for professional misconduct.

CHAPTER 9.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT JUDGES:

SECOND CHRONOLOGY IN A CASE FOR PUBLISHING THE CRIMINAL OFFENCES OF LESTER ETC:

On 22/02/95 the 1995 Africa Centre allowed me to use its conference hall, to address a press conference.

On 21/02/95 I posted, to the Law Society, a copy of the booklet that I was going to read in the press conference. It was entitled:

HAS THE LAW SOCIETY COMMITTED THESE OFFENCES?

A PLEA FOR A PUBLIC ENQUIRY.

BLACKMAIL LETTER.

On 22/02/95, before I started to address the press conference, I received a letter from Solicitor Robin Lewis of Bindman & Partners. It stated:

"**Your paper are ...a flagrant defamation of a number of those involved in the defence of proceedings which you brought before the London South Tribunal on October 31st 1994. This letter is to put you upon notice that should you continue with these matters you may render yourself**

liable to legal proceedings".

I learnt, that Robin Lewis had also written a similar threatening letter, to Africa Centre! He threatened the Africa Centre with legal action, if they allowed me to address a meeting, in their hall!

LAW SOCIETY'S BLUFF EXPOSED!

It was thus right and proper that I should open the press conference, by reading the blackmailing letter from Solicitor Robin Lewis. Fortunately, the Law Society had sent its secretary, to take down, word by word, whatever I said.

I read the letter. I then told the press conference that I welcomed the decision of Lord Lester, Robin Lewis and the Gang of Four, to bring an action against me, for libel, and for committal proceedings for contempt of court.

But, I added that I did not believe, that these most corrupt lawyers, would risk initiate libel case against me! Obviously they were quire sure, that, if they brought a case against me, the Oscar Wilde fate would overtake them! The English jury was bound to hold that the libel was justified!

Thereafter, I read the press booklet. It exposed mercilessly, the nature of corruption within the Law Society. It then appealed for a public enquiry.

THEE SEARCH FOR A CORRUPT JUDGE:

On 24/02/95 Mr. Robin Lewis of Bindman & Partners, Solicitors, on behalf of Lord Lester, and the Gang of Four, wrote a letter to the Industrial Tribunal to initiate committal proceedings against me, for contempt of court! They knew, of course, that the Industrial Tribunal did not have jurisdiction for contempt of court!

But they were hunting for a particular judge, whom they had blackmailed, Donnelly, to try the case!

Unfortunately for them, I had over exposed the susceptibility of Donnelly to blackmail. As the saying goes, once burnt, twice shy. And so, on 06/04/95 the Industrial Tribunal replied to their letter stating:

"You will be aware that the Industrial Tribunal is "an inferior court" for the purpose of contempt proceedings under Order 52, Rule 1(2)(iii) of the Rules of the Supreme Court and this position was confirmed recently in Peach Grey and Co (a firm) -v- Sommers : "The Times" 16 February 1995. It must be for the parties to decide whether they wish to commence such proceedings, bearing in mind their own interests".

Now that their conspiracy to defeat the end of justice, by having their case heard by a bias Chairman Donnelly, of their choice, had been frustrated, I wondered what the Lester and

the Gang of Four would do!

FURTHER LETTER OF BLACKMAIL!

On 03/05/95, Solicitor Robin Lewis, on behalf of Lord Lester and the Gang of Four wrote to me a letter. It was another attempt at blackmail. It stated:

"We are instructed to seek your undertaking (1) that you will not distribute any further copies of the pamphlet ... We are instructed to say that we shall make an application to the Divisional Court in respect of your contempt of the Industrial Tribunal unless we receive your undertaking within the next 14 days"!

FURTHER EXPOSURE OF THE LAW SOCIETY'S BLUFF!

I was amazed at this continued attempt to blackmail me! Lord Lester and the Gang of Four ought to have known 3 things:

- They were, I was not, susceptible to blackmail.

- They had, I had not, anything to hide.

- They do, I do not, bluff.

On 08/05/95 I called their bluff. My solicitors gave a reply to their letter. It was in the form of a counter notice to:

"Bindman and Partners, and through Bindman and Partners Solicitors to all the Defendants named above (sic. Mr. John Rendall, Nicholas Saunders, Mark Hone, Anne Cole, Lord Lester Q.C. , R. Lewis) of the intention of the Client to join as parties to the suit the 6 individuals named above ...

"Our Client will seek from the court, declaratory judgements to the effect that each and every one of the 6 individuals has committed the civil and criminal offences with which they are charged in the two booklets".

FURTHER SEARCH FOR A CORRUPT JUDGE!

My notice forced Lord Lester, Solicitor Robin Lewis and the Law Society Gang of Four, to decide on 2 courses of action:

1. To avoid investigations of their criminal offences by a British jury, they dared not bring any case against me in the High Court.

2. They must look for another bias judge to try the case. The bias judge was of course, Lord Lester's colleagues, in the Bar Council!

And so, on 13/05/95, Anne Coles, the Law Society's Legal Adviser, applied to the Bar Council, take disciplinary action

against me. She also complained against two other English Barristers: one white, and one black. The complaint was that, contrary to the order of the Industrial Tribunal, the 3 of us had published documents obtained by discovery. The documents disclosed:

"The names and addresses and personal details of the applicants who are subject to the order of confidentiality".

JUDGEMENT ACCORDING TO COLOUR OF SKIN:

I was the main culprit. The complaint against a Black Barrister, Mr. Emmanuel Oteng, and a White Barrister, Mr. Michel Aslangul, was that they had assisted me, in publishing confidential personal details! Though it was proved that none of the two barristers knew the content of the published documents, yet, the two barristers were treated very differently:

Investigations against the White English Barrister, Mr. Michel Aslangul, were dropped.

Investigations against the Black English Barrister, Mr. Emmanuel Oteng, were continued! It ended with his being reprimanded, for having assisted me!

The sole ground for the different treatment was, manifestly, the colour of their skin.

Twelve days after receiving the complaint against me, from the Law Society, that is, on 25/05/95, the Bar Council wrote a letter to me. It required me to "comment" on the complaint made against me.

MY DEFENCE:

A week later, on 02/06/95 I lodged my defence to the charge made against me. The defence was subsequently amended. There were over 10 points of defence. The 6 main points of law that they raise are:

1. By virtue of the provision of s. 1(2) of the Tribunal and Enquiry (Evidence) Act 1922, as well as by virtue of the provision of Order 52 Rule 1 of the Supreme Court, the Bar Council had no jurisdiction to entertain the complaint against me i.e. prior to the determination of the High Court. The law specifically provides that no person can be punished, for a breach of the order of the Industrial Tribunal, except on a finding, by the High Court, that a breach had taken place.

2. Again, by virtue of the provision of section 4(1) of the Criminal Law Act 1967, the case against me was a manifest error of law. This is because the law makes it my mandatory duty, to disclose confidential documents that prove the commission of criminal offences. It was in compliance with

that law that I disclosed the documents that prove, beyond reasonable doubt, that Lord Lester, Solicitor Robin Lewis, and the Law Society's Gang of Four, had committed arrestable offences.

3. Again, the Contempt of Court Act 1981 specifically provides that a person who publishes in writing, or by speech, to the public at large, matters which tend to interfere with the course of justice, cannot be punished, except on the basis of High Court decision.

4. The complaint was an abuse of process of the court. Lord Lester, Solicitor Robin Lewis, and the Law Society's Gang of Four had made the complaint merely as a means of covering up their criminal offences. They had threatened to bring a libel suit. Why had they not brought it? The answer is simply that the jury would have found the libel justified.

5. By virtue of the conflict of interest rule, the Bar Council had no locus standi to try me on matters arising from my racial discrimination by the Law Society. This was because the Law Society held and maintained, throughout, that the guidelines that was the cause of my discrimination, was made by the Law Society in agreement with the Bar! Hence, the Bar could not be a judge in its own cause.

6. The complaint was incompetent in law. This is because the content of documents disclosed, had ceased to be confidential, when it was pleaded in court, and argued in an open court, during the hearing of the case.

MY COUNTER COMPLAINT:

In addition to my defence, I also lodged a counter complaint against Lord Lester, Solicitor Robin Lewis, and the Law Society's Gang of Four. I charged them with the offences of fraudulent concealment, conspiracy to defeat the end of justice, breaches of professional undertaking and blackmail. The particulars of the offences are given in the chronology of events in this book. The charges arising therefrom are given in Chapter 31.

Throughout the material time, I kept on pointing out that the complaint to the Bar Council was a conspiracy. Lord Lester dared not face a jury trial and have his fraudulent conduct exposed! Hence his conspiracy to have me charged before his colleagues who would refuse to investigate his offences!

WILFUL BLINDNESS:

The response of the Anonymous Judges to my defence and counter complaint was that of wilful blindness!

They pretended that I had raised no defence at all!

They pretended that I had made no complaint at all, against Lord Lester!

They pleaded that they had no jurisdiction over Solicitor Robin Lewis and the Law Society Gang of Four. But they did not consider it necessary to direct that there be a change of venue, to the High Court, which has jurisdiction over all the parties!

None would believe that justice could be so openly and manifestly defeated in this country which Old John of Gaunt has, so very touchingly describes as:

This royal throne of kings, this scepter'd isle

This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars

This other Eden, demi-paradise!

MORE LIES FROM ANNE COLES:

Immediately on being sent a copy of my formal complaint against them, Anne Coles, the Legal Adviser of the Law Society resorted to her usual falsehood! She prepared what she called a "draft affidavit" for instituting, in the High Court, committal proceedings for contempt of court, against me! She knew that if she lodged that affidavit in court, she might end up in prison, for perjury. It goes without saying that she never lodged it in court! Instead, she sent it to the anonymous judges

of the Bar Council! It was, in any case, part and parcel of the conspiracy to defeat the end justice. The Bar Council accepted the draft affidavit as evidence that the Law Society was seriously considering bringing contempt proceedings against me, in the High Court! That was to be expected from judges who are also conspirators!

I insisted on calling Anne Coles' bluff. I demanded that she should be asked to state categorically whether she was or was not going to bring committal proceedings in the High Court. At long last, she was obliged to confess that it was all a bluff! On 21/08/95 she wrote:

"I ... confirm that the Law Society has no proposal at present to commence proceedings for contempt of court in respect of matters currently complained about".

MANIFEST RACIAL DISCRIMINATION:

Meanwhile, I continued to complain about the discriminatory treatment by the Anonymous Judges of the Bar Council. Lord Lester and the Gang of Four had complained against my conduct to the Bar Council. Their complaint was initiated by a simple telephone call, followed by a letter. My complaint against Lord Lester was made in a formal pleading. Yet, it continued to be ignored, as if it was never made!

At long last, on 04/10/95 the Anonymous Judges of the Bar wrote to me stating that if I wanted to make a formal

complaint against Lord Lester, then I initiate the proceedings, by filling the enclosed complaint form!

I refused to be a party to my own racial discrimination. Lord Lester and the Gang of Four had started a case against me without filling any forms. I was not going to start a case against Lester by filling forms!

On 13/02/96 the Anonymous Judges of the Bar again wrote to me saying:

"If you wish to raise a formal complaint against Lord Lester Q.C. then you should complete the complaint form".

On 15/02/96, I wrote a letter to the Anonymous Judges pointing out that it was wrong, in law, to have discriminatory complaint procedure.

On 19/02/96 the Anonymous Judges acknowledged the receipt of my letter. Then on 14/03/96 the Anonymous Judges again wrote to me a letter. This time they asked me to indicate definitely, whether I wished to make a complaint against Lord Lester Q.C. They claimed, falsely, that my continued failure to fill a complaint form meant that it was still unclear whether I wished my complaint to be investigated!

On 22/03/96 I gave a reply to their letter stating:

"Your continued pretence, for instance, that you did not know that I wanted to make a complaint against Lord Lester, as if all the accusations I made against him, were merely for the

fun of it, only adds insult to injury".

On 26/03/96, at long last, the Anonymous Judges wrote to me stating that it had passed to the PCC, the clearest expression of my intention, to have my complaints against Lord Lester investigated!

It all ended, as it was expected to end:

The PCC decision was never communicated to me!

My complaint against Lord Lester was never investigated!

RACIALLY DISCRIMINATORY INVESTIGATIONS:

Meanwhile, while on the one hand, the Anonymous Judges continued to do everything to frustrate the investigation of my complaint against Lord Lester, yet, on the other hand, they continued to do everything to smear me with guilt! On 20/06/96 they wrote to me a letter stating:

"I must again draw your attention to Paragraph 801(c) of the Code of Conduct which states that it is the duty of a barrister to respond promptly to any request for comments or information on a complaint... If I do not receive a reply to my letter of 25 May within two weeks of the date of this letter, I will have no option but to put the matter before the committee without your comments"!

It took the anonymous judges about a year and a half to decide to charge me of contempt of the order of the Industrial Tribunal! They brought 2 charges against me. They were identical charges. There was thus no legal basis for making them 2 different charges. But, the Anonymous Judges were not after justice. Fortunately, their barrister for the Bar, Counsel Richard Clayton, was. The charges were:

Dr. N A Adoko on divers dates between the first day of January 1995 and the 23 day of February 1995 caused a pamphlet entitled, "Has the Law Society committed these offences"? to be circulated or distributed. The said pamphlet discolsed the names or personal details of a number of solicitors from documents which has been disclosed to the Defendant pursuant to the order of the Industrial Tribunal dated the 19 May 1994 for use in and in connection with Industrial Tribunal Proceedings number 1248/94 only. Pursuant to the order, the document had been edited so as to disguise the identities of the persons in order to preserve confidentiality. In breach of the confidentiality, the Defendant published names in the said pamphlet.

Dr. N A Adoko on divers dates between the 1st. day of January 1995 and the 23 day of February 1995 caused a pamphlet entitled, "Has the Law Society committed these offences"? to be circulated or distributed. The pamphlet used information derived from the documents, documents

containing the personal details of a number of solicitorsm which had been disclosed to the Defendant on discovery in the Industrial Tribunal case number 1248/94 for the purpose of these proceedings alone.

CHAPTER 10.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT JUDGES:

CHAIRMAN DAVID BOOTH: THE MOST CORRUPT JUDGE.

David Booth, a Judge of the Mad Dog type.

The damage caused by the judgement of corrupt judge David Booth is far worse than the rabies of a mad dog.

DAVID BOOTH: THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGE:

The most important thing to know about the Law Society is that it never implements the law! It implements its guidelines, or its policy, or its practice, which it claims, falsely, to be prepared from the law! In fact, whenever the law provides for whatever the officials of the Law Society do not like, the Law Society prepares a guideline, or policy, or practice which is as different from the law, as chalk is from cheese!

In 1993, the Law Society had decided not to exempt me. So they prepared guidelines for the implementation of the law for exempting English Barristers! The guideline was the very contradiction of the law! The law required proof of knowledge. The guidelines did not require proof of knowledge. The law treated all English Barristers in the same way. The Guidelines treated English Barristers differently! And so, I challenged the legality of the said Guidelines in the Industrial Tribunal. The Tribunal ordered that the Guideline was not lawful.

In 1996, the Law Society again found itself in a similar predicament. They did not want to admit me as a solicitor. Under the law, they were bound to admit me either straightaway, or within a year. They did not want to do that. So, they refused to abide by the law. They decided to abide by their practice! Their practice was again the very contradiction of the law! The law provided that if they had cause, to believe that I was not of good conduct, the Law Society itself should investigate the matter. The law does not provide that they should first refer the cause of their complaint for determination to a third party or body! Yet the practice of the Law Society, or so I was told, provided that the Law Society

should refer the cause of its complaint against me, for decision, to a third body! The law requires investigation to be done as soon as possible. The practice delays investigation for several years!

So I again applied to the Industrial Tribunal to determine whether the practice being followed by the Law Society, which had referred its complaint against me to be investigated by the Bar, was lawful or not!

Had the case come before an impartial judge, I would have won it. The practice would have been declared unlawful.

Unfortunately for me, the case came before the most corrupt judge! He is Chairman David Booth of the Industrial Tribunal! I know very many corrupt judges. But, none is comparable to Booth. There is no question whatsoever, in my mind, that he is the most corrupt judge in the whole world!

Since then, every time I see David Booth, I remember the fable about the thorn tree that became a King of trees! According to that fable, all good trees refused to be the king, because each of them was busy looking after its fruits. The thorn, having no fruits to look after, but cruel thorns, accepted the honour.

In the same way, good lawyers seem to have been too busy, running their successful legal practice, to accept to be the Chairman of the Employment Tribunal. The result was that, David Booth, because of his corrupt and malicious nature, that disabled him from succeeding in legal practice, ended up as

the Chairman of the Industrial Tribunal!

By nature, Booth is a breaker of oath. In his judicial oath, he pawned his solemn pledges to the nation that he would render justice to all without fear or favour. In this case alone, his honour has been several times forfeited! Yet, every time he sits on the judgement seat, he continues to mortgage it! Since he is so dishonourable as not to be bound by the laws of the country, it was only to be expected, that he could not be bound by his words!

Throughout his trial of the case that I brought against the Law Society for racial discrimination, Chairman David Booth of the Employment (then known as the Industrial) Tribunal displayed predominantly the attribute of judicial corruption. We thus referred to him as Booth the Corrupt. It is hardly possible to believe, in spite of widespread corruption of these modern times, that the conduct and judgement of a British Judge, appointed by Lord Chancellor, would violate all principles most sacred to our laws. Yet, I was obliged to swear an affidavit to prove, in a court of law, that Booth is, not only the most corrupt judge in England, but is one of the most corrupt judges in the world.

The affidavit was handed to Chairman Booth himself to enable him, in case he held that I perjured myself, to apply to the Police, or to the Crown Prosecution Service, to prosecute me. As expected, Booth did not make the application. In law, his failure to report my accusation either to the court, or to the authorities, was an admission that the accusations in the

affidavit, were true.

CHAIRMAN DAVID BOOTH AS A CORRUPTER OF JUSTICE

The threefold points proved in the affidavit are:

1. Chairman David Booth was not merely the most corrupt judge in England, but was also one of the most corrupt judges in the world.

2. The main object of David Booth, in his conduct of the case for racial discrimination that I had brought against the Law Society, was to cover up the criminal offences committed by Lord Lester Q.C., Solicitor Robin Lewis, and the 4 members of staff of the Law Society, generally known as the Gang of Four i.e. Director John Rendall, Head of Department Nicholas Saunders, Legal Adviser Anne Coles and Manager Mark Hone.

3. That Booth himself is so conversant with the nature of his corruption that he dared not take any action on the accusation, for the purpose of clearing his name. The affidavit published the full account of his perversion of the course of justice. It challenged him, if he dared, to bring any action on the accusation which would result in a judicial investigations of his conduct. It also warned him that if he dared bring any action, he would make me, his Marquess of Queensbury. In the alternative, he would make himself, my Oscar Wilde! The

only decent alternative to his application for judicial investigation was for him to resign from the judiciary. He has, in any case, by virtue of his corruption, already opted out of the judiciary.

PUBLICATION OF CRIMINAL OFFENCES OF LORD LESTER Q.C.

PLEADED GROUNDS FOR RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

On 29/10/97 the main ground of my case for racial discrimination against the Law Society was pleaded thus:

· **On 21/12/95, after 5 years of its continued refusal to exempt me from sitting for any test to become a solicitor, the Law Society finally exempted me. However, the exemption was made subject to the condition that I was not to be admitted as a solicitor, because of the complaint that I had published the documentary evidence of criminal offences that disclose the criminal offences committed by Lord Lester and others!**

The said condition was, as stated above, contrary to the law and discriminatory against me on racial grounds.

BOOTH SHOWS HIS BIAS:

On 23/09/96, before the case came for interlocutory hearing, an incident occurred that revealed that proved that the Law

Society had taken precaution to obtain a bias judge to try the case. Without giving me an opportunity to be heard on my application for an order for discovery of documents, which I needed to prove that the Law Society had discriminated against me on racial grounds, and without any objections whatsoever from the Law Society about my being given those documents, Mr. Booth, on his own, ordered that documentary proof of racial discrimination, should not be disclosed to me! In the word of the Tribunal`s letter:

"A Chairman of the Tribunal has stated your application for discovery is too wide and has therefore rejected it on these grounds"

DENIAL OF DISCOVERY

I had applied for the discovery in writing. I quoted the provisions of law which makes it mandatory for the Tribunal to order such discovery. Only a judge with a hidden agenda would have behaved in the way that Booth behaved.

First I pointed out that s. 1(1)(a) and s. 12 of the Race Relations Act 1976 made it mandatory to compare the less favourable treatment that the Law Society has meted to me, a Black English Barrister, with the more favourable treatment that it has meted to my colleagues, the White English Barristers. It also made it mandatory for the documentary basis of comparisons to be disclosed to the parties.

Further, I specifically pleaded a number of precedents as the legal authority that Discovery was mandatory. Amongst them,

I pleaded th following precedents:

The precedent that an applicant to the court is entitled to discovery of documents that would enable him to make a comprehensive analysis between his own qualification and history and those of his competitors. (See: In Resul v. Commission for Racial Equality [1978] I.R.L.R. 203).

The precedent that a document has to be produced however contrary to the interest of the party producing it` and `however fatal to the claim upon which` the party producing it must have. (In Flight v. Robinson [1844] Beav: 22: Lord Langsdale M.R).

And, the precedent that public interest dictates that documents and facts which constitute abuse of power of a public office cannot be protected. (Gamden Chemical Co (U.K.) v. Rochem Ltd [1983]) etc.

DISCRIMINATORY ORDER FOR DISCOVERY

On the one hand, Booth refused my application for discovery without giving me an opportunity of being heard in the matter. On the other hand, he allowed the application of the Law Society for discovery without giving me an opportunity of being heard in the matter! Nor was that all! He even threatened me with conviction and a fine of £1000.00 if I failed to comply with his order for discovery in favour of the Law Society! The threats reads:

"following an application by the Respondent the Chairman of the Tribunal has Ordered that on or before

25th. November 1996 you send to the Respondent a list of" documents upon which you intend to rely at the hearing on 28 and 29 November 1996 and that failure to comply with this Order may result in summary conviction in a fine of up to Pounds 1000.00"!

DENIAL OF PLEADING:

The first time I met Chairman Booth was on 25 September 1996. He was presiding over the direction hearing of my claim, against the Law Society for racial discrimination. The first thing that left an indelible impression upon me was his flouting of the requirements of the ABC of procedural law! However, it soon became clear to me that he was flouting the law, not because of ignorance of the law as such, but because he had, to put it colloquially, an axe to grind.

Instead of asking me, as the Applicant, to make submissions first, he asked Solicitor Robin Lewis, representing the Law Society, to do so. I did not mind that. Taking advantage of the Chairman's manifest bias in favour of the Law Society, Solicitor Robin Lewis astounded me, and my counsel, by asking Chairman Booth to set a date for the Law Society to apply to strike out my claim!

Naturally I objected strongly to the application for striking out a case, being made before pleadings were completed! But Booth had evidently been chosen to hear the case, or opted to hear the case, because of his judicial bias. He was past pretending that he was doing justice! He simply ignored my objections without even bothering to answer them! Every

word he said, was meant to impress upon the parties that:

Booth was bias!

In a Third World country, his behaviour would have been interpreted as evidence of bribery. But, being in England, it could only be interpreted, as evidence of judicial corruption or blatant racism.

On 17/11/97 I reapplied to the Tribunal for discovery. I pointed out that to refuse me discovery of the documents, which prove racial discrimination against me, would deny me a fair hearing of my case. It would thus be contrary to article 6 of the European Commission of Human Rights and Fundamental Liberties.

I also pointed out to Chairman Booth that for him to refuse me discovery, in the light of what had happened, would amount to Wednesbury unreasonableness. This is because:

i. The Law Society had asked, in writing, for better particulars to be supplied by way of answers to its interrogatories.

ii. I had applied for answers to be given to my interrogatories. I had also applied for discoveries of the documents in the possession of the Law Society.

iii. The Chairman had excluded from the documents to be discovered, all those documents whose copies had already been given to me. But he had not yet ordered the date on which the documents not in my possession were to be

disclosed to me.

FALSE EXCUSE GIVEN BY BOOTH

In obedience to the order issued by Chairman Booth, that the scope of discovery of documents that I had applied for, was too wide, I had reapplied for limited discovery. The scope was limited thus:

1. Documents pertaining to admissions, as Solicitors, of all English Barristers who, from the year 1990 up to 1995 applied for exemption and were exempted by the Respondent.

2. Documents pertaining to the exemptions, by the Law Society from 02/11/94 when the Tribunal ordered that the Law Society had discriminated against me on racial grounds, to 13 December 1995 when the Law Society ultimately exempted me.

Booth refused to consider the application! No judge, who is acting in good faith would ever refuse to consider the application properly put before it. It was thus clear that Booth was not acting in good faith.

I was obliged to point out to Booth that, in law, the effect of his unlawful conduct, amounted to racial discrimination against me. The words I used were:

"In a case of racial discrimination, denial of discovery of documents which disclose the racial discrimination complained of is itself, part of racial discrimination and

contrary to Article 14 of the European Convention of Human Rights which prevents discrimination".

I further accused him of deliberate engagement in activities, which destroy the fundamental rights of ethnic minorities. This is what I stated:

"Denial of discovery of documents which disclose racial discrimination is contrary to Article 17 which prevents engagement in activities which destroy fundamental rights of others".

COVERING UP THE OFFENCES OF ROBIN LEWIS

I also applied that it was contrary to the rule of natural justice for Robin Lewis to represent the Law Society. This was because the Law Society was a public body subject to the legal requirement to act fairly. It could not be seen to be acting fairly if Lewis represented it. This was because the Law Society already knew that Robin Lewis had threatened me with a High Court action for defamation. And had also threatened to bring committal proceedings against me for contempt of court. He never brought any of the threatened actions!

It was thus manifestly unfair that whereas Robin Lewis could not defend his indefensible reputation, he was ready to avenge himself against me, at the expense of the public purse! His instructions were thus a misuse of public fund. And it was an abuse of the power of a public office.

The point of law that my application raised was of great

public interest. Yet, Booth simply ignored it! Lord Denning has expressed the point of law thus:

A public body "must not misuse its powers: and it is a misuse of power for it to act unfairly or unjustly towards a private citizen where there is no overriding public interest to warrant it: H.T.V. Ltd v. Price Commission [1976] 1 C.R. 170 at 185-186.

Further, the rule of natural justice requires that the proceeding

"must be conducted in a way which is fair ... in all the circumstances": R: The Commissioner for Racial Equality ex.p. Cottre4ll & Rothon [1980] 1 WLR 1580 CA. 207 9043.

I was thus obliged to apply to Chairman Booth, to refer, for the decision of the High Court, the point of law that formed the basis of my objection, to the appearance of Robin Lewis. I applied to him to ask the High Court to rule whether, in law, Robin Lewis had a locus standi to represent the Law Society in the circumstances. Mr. Booth refused the application! The only reason he gave was that he could not state a case to the High Court, before he himself had made a decision in the matter. Yet, he also refused to make a decision in the matter! It is as if Booth had resorted the gambler's logic:

Head, Booth won. Tail, I lost!

BOOTH'S DEFIANCE OF THE LAW.

If there was any doubt whatsoever about Booth being the most

corrupt judge in the world, that doubt ceased to exist when Booth began to defy the law openly. Regulation 7(4) of the Industrial Tribunals (Constitution and Rules of Procedure) Regulations 1993, specifically provided that the Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to prevent a party from having his case heard on the ground that:

"upon a pre-hearing review the tribunal considers that the contention put forward by any party in relation to a matter required to be determined by a tribunal has no reasonable prospect of success".

Further Regulation 7(9) specifically provides that Booth, as the person who determined the pre-hearing application cannot be a party to the hearing of the case on merit. The regulation states:

"No Member of a tribunal which has conducted a pre-hearing review shall be a member of the tribunal at the hearing of the originating application".

By virtue of that provision of the law, on 25/09/96 Booth himself ordered that, after the his pre-hearing review of the case, he himself, as the person to determine the pre-hearing review, will not be a party to the hearing of the case on its merit.

However, thereafter, something happened to make Booth change his mind! Knowing the blackmailing tactics of Solicitor Robin Lewis, the only plausible explanation is that he impressed one thing upon Booth:

If you do not try the case, the Law Society will again be found to have discriminated against Dr. Adoko on racial grounds!

And so, on 16/10/97 Booth caused a letter to be written to Solicitor Robin Lewis. The letter stated that after the Law Society had made its application to strike out my claim:

"We could make a start on the full hearing"!

The new order was directly contradictory to both, the law, and to the order that Booth himself had made at the direction hearing on 25/09/96!

On 16/11/96 I sent a Fax to the Tribunal pointing out that Mr. Booth has no power in law to vary his own order the way he did! Consequently the new order was null and void in law. The fax stated:

"During direction hearing, the Chairman ruled that any Chairman and assessors who would hear the applications, in this matter, would not be qualified to hear the case. Your letter to Bindman & Partners now states that after the hearing of the applications "we could make a start on the full hearing"!

"Procedurally, it seems to me premature to talk of a full hearing. There has been no defences lodged to my amended application. Nor has discovery, which is legally mandatory in the case, been effected. Indeed, my brief answer to any application to strike out my claim before discovery will be that it is premature and incompetent in law. Apart from demanding discovery, and defences to my amended

application, I will make no other applications. At the most, the hearing should not take more than a couple of hours".

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION BY BOOTH In the same fax, I also complained about the way Mr. Booth was discriminating against me on racial grounds. He ensured that he gave replies to all letters written on behalf of the Law Society. He did not give replies to many of my applications save when the reply was to the advantage of the Law Society! Therefore, on 20 November 1996, I applied to Mr. Booth thus:

The Applicant, above named, being aggrieved by the decision of the Chairman conveyed to him in a letter dated 15 November 1996 and received by him, on 20 November 1996, refusing his application for an Order for discovery, hereby gives Notice of his Intention to Appeal against the said decision, either by way of case stated or otherwise, for a declaration that the said decision, in law, is a nullity and evidence of judicial bias.

The Applicant takes it for granted that the Notice to Appeal operates as a stay of further action by the Tribunal and applies to the Tribunal to rule that pending the decision of the appellate court, the hearing of the application scheduled for 28/11/96 has been indefinitely postponed.

Booth ignored the application! By virtue of the tenet that justice must not only be done but must be seen to be done, no self-respecting judge would have ignored such very serious

charges.

DENIAL OF LEGAL REPRESENTATION

At the hearing of the case on 28/11/96 Booth sought to deny me legal representation! Indeed, he succeeded to so! Immediately the hearing opened he asked whether my Counsel, Mr. Emmanuel Oteng, a former High Court Judge in Uganda, had lawful authority to represent me! Oteng replied that he had.

OTENG WITHDRAWS

Whereupon Booth demanded to see the back sheet of the instructions given to Counsel Emmanuel Oteng by a firm of solicitors. Oteng produced it.

Booth stated that he was satisfied that the legal requirements for instructions of Counsel had been complied with. However, Booth added that he wondered whether in the circumstances, it were wise for Oteng to appear and represent me! The circumstances being that Mr. Oteng was reported to the Bar, by the Law Society, for having chaired a public meeting in which I disclosed the documents that proved that Counsel Lord Lester, Solicitor Robin Lewis, and the Gang of Four had committed criminal offences!

Thereupon Oteng took the cue and applied to be allowed to withdraw from representing me.

Booth granted the application with immense satisfaction. He

added:

I commend you. It is a wise decision.

I was thus obliged to appear in person.

BOOTH REFUSES TO WITHDRAW

I immediately applied to Mr. Booth to withdraw from chairing the pre-hearing review. I quoted the above evidence of his racism and judicial bias.

Thereafter, Mr. Booth embarked upon a series of adjournments! I would raise a particular point of law. Mr. Booth and his 2 lay members would withdraw to discuss it. He would come back with the decision that my application was refused. As I had anticipated from a manifestly biased judge, Booth firmly refused to withdraw from chairing the pre-hearing review. I asked him to read to me his written ruling on the issue. He said that he had not written it. Then he added that he would write it later!

He never wrote it! His record keeping cannot thus be described, either as honest or as impartial.

FROM THE FRYING PAN INTO THE FIRE.

Although Mr. Booth had welcomed, as wise, the decision of Mr. Oteng, not to represent me, he now changed his mind! He had wrongly deducted because Mr. Oteng was called Counsel, and I was not called Counsel, therefore, left on my own, I would not be able to argue any point of law. He forgot the

Shakespearean adage:

What is there in a name? A rose by any other name would smell equally sweet!

He soon discovered that although I was no Counsel, I was not inarticulate either. It began to appear that in removing Mr. Oteng, he might have jumped from a frying pan, into the fire.

Suddenly, the most unexpected thing happened! Booth requested Mr. Oteng if Oteng would like to resume his role as my counsel! This fickleness, did nothing to inspire one's trust, either in his honesty or his impartiality!

To make matters worse, he appeared as the piper who was playing any tune called by the Law Society. Indeed, he specifically asked Robin Lewis, representing the Law Society, whether he would also have a change of mind, to allow me, to be represented by Mr. Oteng. Whereupon Mr. Robin Lewis said that he had no objection to my being represented by Mr. Oteng!

As my view was considered by Booth to be immaterial, he did not ask me whether I would like Mr. Oteng to represent me!

However, Oteng was asked that since both the Tribunal and the Law Society had no objection to his representing me, would he consent to represent me. Oteng was not fooled by the cause for the change of heart! He gave a simple reply to Booth's question. He said:

No.

LAW SOCIETY DICTATES TO CHAIRMAN BOOTH

Solicitor Robin Lewis, on behalf of the Law Society made a short application. He asked that my case be dismissed because, on the face of it, it does show that the Law Society had treated me less favourably on racial ground. I had committed a breach of the order of the Industrial Tribunal. The Law Society had referred the matter for necessary investigation by my professional body, the Bar Council. The reference for necessary investigations could not conceivably be regarded as my being treated less favourably or discriminatorily. In such circumstances, the Law Society treated all applicants, white or black, in the same way. In the course of his submission, Lewis had asked:

What is the point of law upon which the Applicant is relying that proved that his treatment was, in law, less favourable on racial ground?

Later, Booth was to make that question, the need to point out the law that the Law Society had broken, my sole requirement of proof. It became the sole corpus delicti.

After Robin Lewis had made his submissions to strike out my statement of claim, I applied for an adjournment to enable me prepare my answer to the application. On the one hand, my Counsel had been denied the duty of representing me. On the other hand, I had not come prepared to represent myself. I had not carried out the necessary researches on the points of law that might arise. Further, the submission made by the

representative of the Law Society had reduced the issue to be determined to a point of law.

Robin Lewis immediately objected to any adjournment. He insisted that the Law Society wanted the ruling to be made on that day! No reason was given as to why the Law Society wanted the ruling to be made on that day!

It was not the first time that Solicitor Robin Lewis had blackmailed Industrial Tribunals Chairman with the ruse:

The Law Society wants this! The Law Society wants that! The Law Society expects this! And, of course, the every wish of the Law Society was some sort of law!

Robin Lewis had previously blackmailed Chairman Donnelly in similar words!

I was thus obliged to explain to the Tribunal the nature of the ground given by Robin Lewis for his objections. It was merely that Robin Lewis knew that the Law Society was controlling the Tribunal. So, the submission:

"The Law Society wants the ruling to be made today"

I pointed out that such a statement did not make sense to an independent judge! No reason is given for it. But, it made an ominous sense to a judge acting as the puppet of the Law Society!

After my submission the Tribunal again adjourned to consider

the issue.

When it returned, the Chairman ruled that there was to be no adjournment. Booth thus ordered me to continue with my submission!

I declined to do so. I stressed that I had, as a result of the points raised by the Law Society, and ordered by the Tribunal, only one defence. The defence was a point of law. And I needed time to look it up. If I were denied the time to look it up, then I was effectively denied a defence to the application made by the Law Society!

Again there was a further adjournment, to enable the Tribunal to make up its mind, during the one hour lunch break.

When the hearing of the case resumed, the Chairman came up with yet another ploy. He had, he said, looked into the matter once more. He could see no point of law that could justify my violation of the Order of the Industrial Tribunal. There was no question at all that I had published the content of the documents which the Tribunal had ordered me not to publish.

I informed him that he was entitled to his opinion. If he wanted to make his opinion my defence, then, he was entitled to it. However, the law imposed the burden to answer the submissions made by the Law Society, upon me. Not upon him. I repeated that in order to discharge the burden that the law imposed upon me, I needed time to be able to cite the point of law that the Law Society had raised.

Furthermore, I was not asking for a long adjournment. Just a

couple of days.

This time the Tribunal did not withdraw but asked us, the parties, to do so.

When the hearing resumed, we were told that my application for adjournment had been granted. It was ordered that I be given 7 days to submit the point of law on which I relied as my defence. Mr. Booth elaborated that the precedent that I was to rely upon should state that I had a legal right and/or duty to publish the content of documents obtained by way of discovery which, in my opinion, disclosed criminal offence.

MISPRISION OF FELONY.

On 05/12/96, I produced that precedent. I cited perhaps the most authoritative judge of all: Lord Denning. In the case of Sykes v. Director of Public Prosecutions [1962] A.C. 528, which was an appeal from the decision of the Court of Criminal Appeal to the House of Lords, Lord Denning explained the offence of misprision of treason thus:

"Most lawyers know, roughly speaking, what `misprision of felony` means. It means that a man knows that a felony has been committed and neglects to disclose it ...

"... So much for the meaning of the phrase. But now comes the question: Has it ever been an offence known to the law? My Lords, it has always been an offence for the last 700 years or more, not always under the name, `misprision of felony`, but still an offence. Ever since the day of hue and cry, it has been the duty of a man, who knows that a

felony has been committed, to report it to the proper authority so that steps can be taken to apprehend the felon and bring him to justice. [Lord Denning here reviewed the authorities and continued].

"The review of the authorities shows that the essential ingredients of misprision of felony are:

"1. <u>Knowledge</u> . The accused man must know that felony has been committed by some one else. ...

"2. <u>Concealment</u>. The accused man must have `concealed or kept secret` the knowledge. ...

"My Lords, it was said that this offence is out of date. I do not think so. The arm of the law would be too short if it were powerless to reach those who are `contact` men for thieves or assist them to gather in the fruits of their crime; or those who indulge in gang warfare and refuse to help with its suppression. There is no offence for which such person are guilty save that of misprision of felony".

This time, even the Robin Lewis, deemed it wise, not to add to his list of offences, a further offence of misprision of felony. He therefor refrained from dealing with the issue of misprision of felony. In law, his failure to deny the applicability of misprision of felony to the case, is an admission, which entitled me to judgement in my favour.

<u>BOOTH BECOMES, IN LAW, A CRIMINAL</u>

Like Lewis, Booth also ignored the issue of Misprision of

Felony! It was the one and only one issue that he himself had declared to be crucial, namely:

Whether there is any provision of law which imposes a duty upon me to break or which justifies my breach of the order of the Industrial Tribunal.

Yet, having pleaded that point, Booth dared not ask the only question that the law obliges him to ask in the circumstances namely:

Does the law of misprision of felony actually imposed upon Dr. Adoko a duty to disclose documentary evidence which reveal the criminal offences committed by Lord Lester, Robin Lewis, John Rendall, Nicholas Saunders, Anne Coles and Mark Hone?

Indeed, the only supplementary question that could have possibly arisen was:

Does the Industrial Tribunal have jurisdiction to prevent publication of documentary evidence of criminal offences committed by Lord Lester and his accomplices?

It goes without saying that because of his hidden agenda, Booth avoided to ask either the main or the supplementary questions!

Booth could not lawfully rule that Lord Lester, Robin Lewis and their fellow accompices, known as the Gang of Four, had not committed the offences with which they were accused!

- In the first place, they had not yet been tried for the offence.

- In the second place, a court of law, chaired by His Honour Judge Altman, had ruled that a proper trial was necessary to determine whether, or not, the accusations were justified in law.

In order to cover up the criminal offences committed by Lord Lester, Robin Lewis and the Gang of Four, Chairman Booth went on to make a decision that violated what was, in common law, known as Misprision of Felony. It is now mandatory statutory law i.e. section 4(1) of the Criminal Law Act 1968.

BOOTH ILLEGALLY AMENDS HIS OWN ORDER

Booth dismissed my application for racial discrimination. Thereafter, in accordance with the mandatory requirements of the law, as well as in accordance with the order formerly made by Booth, I tried desperately to get the case heard on its merit. But the Tribunal repeatedly informed me that Mr. Booth had still retained the case file! Naturally! More evidence of corruption.

Ultimately I was told that Mr. Booth had said that the case will not be heard on its merit! He had directed the officials to inform me that if I were dissatisfied with his judgement, I should appeal against it!

BOOTH`S TRUE NATURE EXPOSED:

On 11/01/1997 I lodged an appeal against Booth's decision.

The grounds of the were that he was not a fit and proper person to be a judge. They were:

- On the pleadings, I was entitled, in law, to judgement by admission.

- The Chairman was judicially bias.

- The Tribunal erred in law, in failing to order discovery in a case of racial discrimination.

- The Tribunal erred in law in denying me my legal right to have the case heard on its merit.

- The Tribunal erred in law in refusing to deal with my application concerning legal representation of the Law Society by Solicitor Robin Lewis.

ROBIN LEWIS SECRET BLAICKMAIL LETTER

Some 2 months after I had lodged an appeal against the judgement of Mr. Booth, Chairman Booth received a secret blackmail letter from Solicitor Robin Lewis. To the best of my knowledge, apart from Booth and Lewis, there is not any other person who knows the content of that letter!

Its existence was not even known to any third party! No wonder Booth personally kept the file and refuse to return it to the registry!

The existence of the letter was first disclosed, for the first time, by Robin Lewis himself, during the hearing of the

appeal, against the decision of Mr. Booth. The disclosure came about because Mr. Justice Morrison had expressed what amounted to a surprise that ,some two months after the appeal had been lodged against the decision of Mr. Booth, Booth had re-assumed jurisdiction to try the case! Booth had summoned the parties to attend a hearing to determine the issue of cost in the matter! Mr. Justice Morrison wanted to know how Booth came to exercise the jurisdiction which he had already ceased to have. It was then, that Robin Lewis confessed, for the first time, that Booth had assumed jurisdiction on the strength of a secret letter that he Lewis, had written to Mr. Booth! Lewis had written to Booth, behind my back, to decide to deal with the issue of cost! Booth himself did not disclose the existence of the letter to me! On the contrary, he took a secret decision on the basis of the conten of the letter! By definition, that decision is, in law, a conspiracy to defeat justice!

CONFLICT OF INTEREST RULE:

In addition to blackmail, Booth himself had his cause for resenting my exposure, by way of the Notice of Appeal, of his corruption and racism. Under the law, by virtue of conflict of interest, he was disqualified from being a judge in the matter. Yet, once more, he insisted to act as a judge!

BOOTH'S NAKED CORRUPTION.

At the hearing of the application for costs, Booth exhibited his judicial corruption in its naked form. This is not a satirisation of Chairman Booth. His precipitant judicial bias, his ferocious insolence, required no satirisation.

At the hearing of the cost proceeding, Booth refused to read my evidence submitted by way of affidavit! The evidence stated that Chairman Booth had no jurisdiction to entertain cost proceedings. The fact that he had not awarded cost in his judgement, meant that cost was not to be awarded in the matter. The law did not allow him to write a second judgement, for the purpose of awarding costs! Nor could he write another judgement after the appeal, against his former judgement, had represented him as a corrupt judge and a racist. The rule of conflict of interest prevented him from acting as a judge in such a case.

In any case, by virtue of the provision of regulation 7(4) of the Industrial Tribunals (Constitutions and Rules) of Proceedings Regulations1993, costs is not awarded for a pre-hearing review, unless there was to be a hearing on merit!

All the same, Chairman Booth told my Counsel that he was not going to read my affidavit! Further, that he will not allow the assessors to read it!

In the circumstances, Counsel asked to withdraw as no evidence from my side would be accepted by the Court. He was given permission to do so. And he withdrew!

After hearing Robin Lewis, Chairman Booth returned to me, copies of my affidavits which should have been given to the assessors. He kept the one given to him!

SOLICITOR LEWIS RESORTS TO HOOK AND CROOK TACTICS.

Robin Lewis of course knew the law. He knew that costs was not payable. But the temptation to blackmail Booth to do whatsoever he wanted was too much for him! And what is more, he was prepared to ruin me by hook or crook. More especially be crook!

Such is the kind of a solicitor that the Gang of Four in the Law Society hires.

BOOTH EXCEEDS HIS OWN CORRUPTION

The law provideS that, had the case been heard on its merit, and had I lost it after the pre-hearing ruling had been made against me, I would be made to pay costs of £150.00. But Lewis told Booth that £150 which the law permits was too small for a person like me who fights against the Law Society! I needed to be taught a lesson. Hence Booth made an order for the cost to be above what the law permits! The cost was to be taxed. And it was taxed at a sum exceeding £8000.00!

At the appeal Mr. Justice Morrison asked whether it was true that in spite of the provision of regulation 7(4) that only £150.00 was payable for cases heard on merit after a pre-hearing review, I was actually ordered to pay over £8000.00. Lewis agreed that I was ordered to pay over £8000.00!

Morrison made no comment!

Two questions arise from the conduct of Booth:

First, what could be its explanation?

The answer to that question is:

The explanation is that Booth had ceased to see things with his own eyes. He saw things with the eyes of the Law Society! He was following the secret dictates given to him, in the name of the Law Society, by Robin Lewis! He had become a parrot to the Law Society. More correctly, he was Robin Lewis' parrot.

The second question that arises is:

Can a judge, like Booth, who has displayed such judicial corruption, be allowed to remain on the bench?

The answer is clearly:

Never.

CHAPTER 11.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT JUDGES:

MR. JUSTICE MORRISON:THE MURDER OF JUSTICE.

Macbeth might have murdered sleep. Justice Morrison has murdered more than sleep. He has murdered justice. The title,

Morrison, the Murderer of Justice, fits him well.

Several years ago, Jonathan Swift, described judges, who murder justice, as follows:

"They studiously avoid entering into the merits of the cause but are loud, violent, tedious in dwelling upon all circumstances which are not to the purpose".

And that was exactly what Morrison did. On the one hand, he studiously avoided entering into the merits of the grounds of appeal! As shown below, he did not deal with one single ground of appeal. The sole cause for his avoiding to deal with any ground of appeal is that, if he dealt with any ground of appeal, he would find himself irresistibly forced, by the merit of its logic, to make a ruling in my favour. And that he dared not do!

Where a judge has, as Mr. Justice Morrison did, maliciously, shut his eyes and ears to the evidence presented to him, in order to avoid coming to the conclusions that the evidence irresistibly led to, then, he has opted out of being a judge. He declined jurisdiction! In such cases, the Court of Appeal has, in theory, but not in fact, where the Law Society is concerned, the power to prevent refusal, by given judges:

"of their true jurisdiction by the adoption of extraneous considerations in arriving at their conclusion or in deciding a point other than that brought before them as declining jurisdiction". *(See R. v. Bowman [1989] 1 Q.B. 663, 667)*

Because he had deliberately done what he ought not, as a judge, to have done, namely shut his eyes to material evidence, Judge Morrison, tried to cover up his judicial bias by being loud, violent, tedious in dwelling upon all circumstances which did not constitute the grounds of appeal!.

CONTEMPT OF COURT

For instance, he devoted most of his judgement to the irrelevant issue that I had published, in a press conference, confidential documents!

- A different court had already determined the issue of contempt of court!

- Mr. Justice Morrison had, in a preliminary hearing, already ruled that it was not the issue in the appeal!

EXEMPTION:

Further, the judgement of Morrison also dwelt, at length, on the false allegations, by the Law Society, that I was not exempted because I had failed tests in professional conduct and accounts. The issue of the marks that I obtained in the test had already been determined:

- The Law Society had already admitted that for the purpose of exemption, the passing marks were only 33%. I had obtained 43%. Lord Lester, the Law Society's Counsel, who had made the allegation, had actually passed his law examinations, in the third grade i.e. he obtained much less marks than I did. His aggregate pass marks was in the thirties!

The argument of the Law Society that I, who had obtained over 40% marks should be refused exemption, whereas my white colleagues, in the category of Lord Lester, who had obtained less than 40% marks, should be exempted, was, as we say in law, so outrageous, in its defiance of logic or accepted moral standards, that no sensible person would resort to it. The fact that Morrison, knowing well the decision in the matter, still resorted to it, is proof of his judicial bias.

- A court of law had already ordered that the Law Society had discriminated against me on the issue of marks!

- I had already been exempted by the Law Society!

- Morrison himself had ruled, in a preliminary hearing, that exemption was not in issue in the appeal! .

As seen from above, Morrison deliberately wallowed in lies and deceit while pretending, in his judgement, examining the grounds of appeal!

Clearly, he had already pledged his troth, not to consider my grounds of appeal! His sole concern was to look for excuses for dismissing the appeal! His airs of a judge, were the emptiest affectations! These empty affectations make him not merely false in one or two cases, not merely the author of a few lies, but a person wholly unfit to be a judge, of any court of law.

His was the most treacherous judgement of all. It was judicial treason!

When I read it, the overwhelming web of anger overtook me! It made me cry out:

"Oh judgement! though art fled to brutish beasts. And men have lost their reason".

I said to myself: Poor Morrison! He should advertise himself:

Morrison for Sale: His Judgements are ever fickle:

Changes in favour of the Mighty".

MORRISON UNMASKED:

Nothing has unmasked Mr. Justice Morrison as his own judgement. It enables us to see in front of him, behind him, round him and through him. And we do not like what we see.

We see a snake! A man without a backbone! A judge who is purchasable: not with money; but with status and prejudice!

END JUSTIFIES THE MEANS:

By any standard of judgement, Mr. Justice Morrison is one of the most intelligent judges, we have in the country. The question that arises is thus:

How come that this first class brain, after having judged most sanely, that Chairman David Booth had evidently erred in law, in not appreciating the nature of the issue between the parties, should have reversed that decision, and judged most insanely, by deliberately ignoring all the

issues between the parties?

The answer is simple. To Morrison, the end justifies the means. His end was to defeat justice. The sole means, open to him, for doing so, was never to deal with the grounds of appeal! This was because the grounds of appeal would have irresistibly led to justice. Hence the need to deal with irrelevancies!

FEAR OF HISTORY REPEATING ITSELF:

A judge, such as Mr. Justice Morrison, who has sold himself once, is bound to sell himself again! He cannot thus be trusted to administer justice.

INORDINATE DELAY:

It is not surprising that it took Morrison over 12 months to write a simple judgement, of hardly 15 pages. A judgement, which a just judge would have delivered on the very day the case, was heard!

The unfair and inordinate delay to deliver the judgement, was calculated to add insult to the injury by adding to the injustice, the ordeal of suspense!

JUDGEMENT NOT GIVEN IN OPEN COURT:

Again, contrary to the requirement of the law, that judgement be given in an open court, and, in the presence of the parties, Morrison did not do so. Perhaps, whatever is left of his conscience prevented him from putting himself in a position

of facing the victim of his injustice. And so, he gave me no notice of the day judgement was to be delivered! He simply had the order that he had made in the case, posted to me! No judgement was sent! I had to write for a copy of it, to be sent to me!

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF:

It was not the first time that a judge, who has deliberately written a corrupt judgement, had avoided to deliver it in my presence. Mr. Justice Potts had done the same!

GROUNDS OF APPEAL AVOIDED:

It is important to note that Morrison strictly avoided to deal with any of the following grounds of appeal that were put before him:

DENIAL OF DISCOVERY:

The ground that Chairman Booth had erred in law in denying me discovery of documents. It would have enabled me to make a comparison between the ground for refusing me admission as a solicitor, and the ground for admitting my colleagues, the white English Barristers!

DISCRIMINATORY ORDER FOR DISCOVERY:

The ground that Chairman Booth had treated me less favourably. On the one hand, Chairman Booth refused me discovery that was mandatory in law. On the other hand, he allowed the Law Society discovery, without giving me an

opportunity to be heard in the matter! To stress his bias, Chairman Booth unnecessarily threatened me with conviction and a fine of £1000.00 if I failed to comply with his order for discovery!

COVERING UP THE OFFENCES OF ROBIN LEWIS:

Justice Morrison also ignored the ground of appeal that Chairman Booth had erred in law, in ignoring to make a formal ruling, in a formal application. My application was that it was contrary to the rule of natural justice for Robin Lewis to represent the Law Society. This was because the Law Society was a public body, subject to the legal requirement to act fairly. It could not be seen to be acting fairly if Lewis represented it. Robin Lewis had threatened me with a High Court action, for defamation. And had also threatened to bring committal proceedings against me for contempt of court. He never brought any of the threatened actions! It was thus unfair to allow him to use public money to perpetrate his vengeance!

BOOTH'S DEFIANCE OF THE LAW:

Morrison also ignored a further ground of appeal that Booth had erred in law in denying me my legal right to have my case heard on its merit. The law specifically provided that a litigant whose case is dismissed, on a point of law, at a preliminary hearing, is entitled, as of right to have his case heard on its merit. Booth refused my case to be heard on its merit! He even refused to return the case file to the registry! He conduct was typical that of a judge who had been blackmailed! Why did Booth behave like that? It is because the law specifically

provides that no Member of a tribunal, which has conducted a pre-hearing review, shall be a member of the tribunal, at the hearing of the case itself. Booth knew that if another Chairman heard the case, I would win! Hence his refusal for the case to be heard, on its merit by a different Chairman. And hence, his treacherously hiding the case file! This ground of appeal dealt with fundamental right. The right to access t justice according to the la. No judge, worthy of the name, would have ignored it. The fact that Morrison ignored it is proof of his extreme judicial bias.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION BY BOOTH:

Furthermore, Morrison ignored the ground of appeal alleging racial discrimination by Booth. Throughout the case, Booth treated me less favourably than the Law Society. Invariably he did not answer my applications and correspondences. Invariably he answered the applications and correspondences of the Law Society! In law, such unfavourable treatment amounts to racial discrimination.

MISPRISION OF FELONY:

Morrison also ignored the ground of appeal of misprision of felony, now enshrined under section 4(1) of the Criminal Law Act 1968. I was entitled, as of right, to prove to the Tribunal that the Law Society was victimising me because I lawfully published, by virtue of the law of misprision of felony, the criminal offences committed by Lord Lester, Solicitor Robin Lewis, and the Gang of Four. Yet, in order to cover up the offences committed by Lord Lester and his accomplices,

Booth denied me the legal right to have my case heard on its merit! By avoiding to deal with that issue of misprision of felony, Morrison's judgement is also, in law, a cover up of criminal offences committed by these high and mighty officials!

LACK OF JURISDICTION:

Another ground of appeal that Morrison ignored, was that Booth had no jurisdiction to hear the application for costs, after I had already lodged an appeal against his decision in the same case. My appeal against the decision made by Booth, was a personal attack against him. His personal interest was involved. There was thus a conflict of interest between him, and me. He could not, either in fact, or in law, pretend to be impartial in the circumstances. In law, he could not be a judge in the matter anymore! Yet, Booth reopened the case, to try the issue of cost! In fact, and in law, he reopened the case to victimise me for having had the courage to expose his judicial corruption!

BOOTH'S NAKED CORRUPTION:

Another ground of appeal which Morrison also ignored was that Booth had refused to read the affidavit evidence I submitted on the application for cost. The law is that the court the decision of the court must be based on evidence. Booth decided the issue of cost, not according to evidence! You do not have to be a lawyer to know that the decision made by Booth was a nullity. Yet Morrison made himself wilfully blind to that point too!

THE BLACKMAIL OF BOOTH:

During his hearing of the appeal, Morrison learnt, for the first time, that some 2 months after I had lodged the appeal against the decision of Mr. Booth, the Law Society conspired to defeat justice! Solicitor Robin Lewis, for the Law Society wrote a secret letter to Booth! Its content of remains unknown to the court and to me! All that we know about it is that It directed Booth to order cost against me! Lewis knew that Booth no longer had the jurisdiction to order costs! But he also knew that the Law Society does get away with murder! He also knew that with judges like Booth and Morrison on our Bench, a blind eye would be turned to such blatant injustice! And, God save us! He was right!

BOOTH EXCEEDS HIS OWN CORRUPTION:

Nor was that all. Both, Booth and Lewis also knew that even if Booth had the jurisdiction to order costs, the maximum cost that Booth could order, under regulation 7(4) was £150.00. Yet, knowing that they could get away with it, in the Supreme Court, manned by the like of Potts, Morrison, Kay and so on, they conspired to have costs exceeding £8000.00 awarded! At the hearing of the appeal, Mr. Justice Morrison expressed concern that amounted to an alarm at such gross violation of the law. Was that concern reflected in his judgement? Never!

THE PRACTICE:

I have sued the Law Society 3 times for racial discrimination. First, it was for its use of a racially discriminatory guidelines for exempting English Barristers. I won that case. Second, it

was for undue delay in processing my application for exemption. I lost that case. But the judge held that my application had merit. He held that, although I had not been discriminated against on racial grounds, yet I had been maliciously treated. Third, I challenged the practice used by the Law Society to refer its complaint against me, to the Bar for determination! I held that under the law, such reference, because of the several years delay inherent in it, was racially discriminatory of me. I held that under the law, the Law Society itself, should determine the dispute! Judge Booth did not see the point at all! Mr. Justice Morrison saw it right away. And, before they got on to him, he ruled that I was entitled to challenge the practice. Then, they got on to him, and he studiously avoided entering into th merits of the cause! He became "loud, violent, tedious in dwelling upon all circumstances which are not to the purpose"!

SUMMING UP:

To sum up, the duty as a judge, is to give reasons for refusing the grounds of appeal that have been pleaded and argued before him. The purpose of requiring him to give reasons is that the reasons given, would, if correct, satisfy the litigants, that justice has been done. If not correct, they would give the parties grounds for questioning those reasons.

The fact that Morrison gave no reasons pertaining to the grounds of appeal, but has simply ignored the many grounds of appeal quoted above, is in law, an admission that:

Reasons would have led him to a conclusion different from

the one, which improper motive has led him.

It is an admission, by him, that contrary to his duty, to promote justice, he deliberately acted to defeat the end of justice!

The betrayal of his duty as a judge reflects equally badly upon him as a man. Human beings have no object so dear as the consecration of truth and justice. By the nature of their trust, judges are the prophets of truth and justice. By virtue of their oath of office, they stand for the triumph of truth and justice in the country. They are the prophet of hope, not of doom. They must reinforce our faith in the ultimate triumph of goodness. By punishment, exhortations and example, they must endeavour to reform the unjust and the untruthful.

The introduction of an alien cause of action, for the purpose of defeating the cause of action before the court, which the Morrisons, the Kays and the Potts now consider their invention, is, in fact, not that new. Though judges never resort to such mean conduct, persons accused of criminal offences generally do. Indeed, even St. Paul, resorted to it! When St. Paul went to the Temple with strangers, he was recognised and charged of desecration of the Temple, by taking strangers into it. When Paul noted that his judges were partly Sadducees, and partly Pharisees, he cried out saying:

"Brothers, I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees, touching the hope and resurrection of the dead, I am called in question".

Paul knew well that the case against him had nothing to do

with resurrection! He said it only to cause a rift between the Sadducees and the Pharisees.

In the same way, Morrison knew well, that the case before him had nothing to do with my exemption from any test! Nor had it anything to do with my publishing to the press confidential matters which disclosed the criminal offences committed by Lord Lester, Robin Lewis and the Gang of Four. .

Indeed, he knew that I had already been exempted from all tests to become a solicitor! He also knew that the case against me for publishing confidential matters, had already been heard and determined! The sole case before him was about my admission as a solicitor. Yet, like St. Paul, Mr. Morrison deliberately substituted an alien cause in place of the real cause of action!

His sole motive for a breach of his Oath to the Sovereign, his Judicial Oath, and his Oath to God, was, like that of St. Paul, to defeat the end of justice!

His murder of justice will continue to excite disgust for several years.

Even the perfume of France can never wash away its stench.

CHAPTER 12.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT JUDGES:

ANONYMOUS JUDGES:

The rule of confidentiality which casts a blanket of secrecy over the Bar disciplinary proceedings, has turned the disciplinary proceedings into a conspiracy! The decisions of the Bar Council irrefutably favour certain barristers, and are against certain barristers. Let us give an example. The case of Black English Barrister Emmanuel Oteng and the White English Barrister Michel Aslangul. The Law Society complained against both the barristers, in their capacity as my counsels, in the cases that I brought against the Law Society. Both were accused of having assisted me to publish confidential documents disclosing the names, and personal details, of some solicitors. Both had denied the charges. I corroborated their denial. Before the publication, Counsel Oteng had never heard of the names of those solicitors. Before publication, Counsel Aslangul had innocently assisted me transcribe those names.

Yet, the Anonymous Judges of the Bar decided that Oteng be reprimanded and Aslangul be not investigated!

Oteng had found himself in a most frustrating position! He had found himself in a position similar to that of a person being forced to make a confession about an offence of which he knew nothing! The interrogator invariably complained that

the person was holding something back! And person invariably asked:

What thing?.

The interrogator would reply:

"Something".

The discretion of these anonymous judges appear not to be controlled either by the law, or by the courts! Whatever they decide is absolutely privileged! Nor is there any sanction at all against them individually.

- Their names are not disclosed! Disclosure of the names of a judge is important. It makes him responsible for his decision.

- No reason is given for their decisions! Had reasons been given for the 6 points of law that I raised as my defence, I would never have been charged.

- Invariably, as seen in the case of Counsel Oteng above, they replace the Rule of Law with the Rule of Kith and Kin.

- Invariably, as is seen in my complaint against Lord Lester, the sole governing principle of the Anonymous Judges has become: Who Knows Whom!

- Above all, to the Anonymous Judges, the Rule of Secrecy is supreme! Secrecy gives birth to and shields irresponsibility.

Hence, abominable practice has, for several years, developed unchecked! Though we are barristers and supposed to know

the law, yet, very rarely do we come forward, and demand to know, as I have demanded again and again, answers to the following questions:

- Why is the freedom of information, characteristic of other professional bodies, being denied to me?

- Why was I being denied to know the names of my Anonymous Judges?

- Why have I been denied to see the official correspondences about me in connection with my case?

- Why have I been denied to know the reasons, if any, given by the Anonymous Judges for their decision?

Those questions, if what the Counsel for the Bar had said in the Industrial Tribunal was correct, had caused turmoil within the Bar Council! None dared to answer any of those questions. I asked myself again and again:

Why? What are they hiding?

From what I heard in the Industrial Tribunal, the answer to those questions is very simple:

No disclosure is permitted, because the sole raison d'etre of the system, has been perverted from attainment of legal truth and justice, to covering up of abuses!

Freedom of information in the circumstances would uncover and eradicate hidden forms of abuses of power. Hence, the

decision not to permit it!

Knowledge of what the authorities do, is thus viewed, by some persons in authority, as a weapon. To put a weapon in the hands of persons, not in authority, is regarded as risky. The fear is that some of them might use it!

I was myself President of the Law Society of a sister Commonwealth country, Uganda. We had nothing to hide. Our practice and goal were the same: to ensure freedom of information.

It is a serious reproach upon the Bar of England and Wales, which is the cream of the English lawyers, that it lacks internal dynamics, to permit freedom of information to its members! If permitted, freedom of information would result in a disciplinary system, in which the victims of complaints, are entitled to answers, for what appears as conspiracies to defeat the end of justice. The fact that such answers may be demanded and given, is like the Sword of Damocles. It hangs over the heads of the authority, for the purpose of ensuring, and does ensure that every decision is made fairly and reasons are given for it.

The resolution of the Anonymous Judges to remain anonymous is, in law, an admissions of the accusations that I have made against them:

1. - They dealt in lies, and were ashamed of it.

I dealt in truth, and was proud of it.

2. - Their lies cried out to be hidden. My truth cried out, to be published.

3. - They felt that, all of them, put together, were no match for my truth.

4. - I felt that, my truth, is a match for all of them, put together.

CHAPTER 13.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT JUDGES:

MR. JUSTICE MICHAEL WRIGHT:

Nothing could be said in vindication of the outrageous breaches of the law, by Mr. Justice Michael Wright. He had been appointed to give directions for my trial. Two charges had been made against me, in my capacity as an English Barrister, by the Bar of England and Wales. His duty was to give directions, which would ensure that my trial complied with the legal procedures. The object of such procedures is to establish the truth and to attain justice. It was not his duty to try me. Nor was it his duty to set aside the requirement of due process. Yet, the sum total of his directions was that none of

the accepted procedure for attainment of justice, was to be followed in my case!

MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE

The hearing for direction became a dialogue between him and me. Counsel for the Bar said not a word. He had been reduced to a spectator. It had become unnecessary for him to say anything. The judge had become the prosecutor! The result was what was to be expected from a prosecutor who is also a judge. Miscarriage of justice.

A PLEA FOR A PUBLIC ENQUIRY:

I was charged for allegedly publishing confidential documents in breach of the order of the Industrial Tribunal. The 2 booklets were entitled:

1. - Has the Law Society Committed these Offences?

A Plea for a Public Enquiry.

2. - Should the Law Society Get Away with Fraud, Perjury, Corruption, Racial Discrimination and All the Heinous Offences that it has Committed?

CHANGE OF VENUE:

The first question for direction was one of jurisdiction. Did the Disciplinary Tribunal of the Inns of Court have the jurisdiction to try me for a breach of the order of a court of law i.e. for contempt of court? The Rule of the Supreme Court

Order 52, rule 1, specifically provides that I cannot be punished for contempt of court, unless and until found guilty of it, by the High Court. I accordingly applied to Mr. Justice Wright for a change of venue for the trial, from the Disciplinary Tribunal, to the High Court. I pointed out that the plot by Lord Lester, Lewis, and the so-called Gang of Four, to have the charges tried in the Disciplinary Tribunal, instead of in the High Court, was an attempt to pervert the course of justice. It was a desperate attempt to prevent me to rely on the defence of the criminal offence which they had committed.

In law, if I could prove that Lord Lester and his Gang had committed those crimes, I would win the cases against me. His Honour Judge Altman had already ruled that such a proof was necessary. In law, Mr. Justice Michael Wright had no alternative but to grant my application for a change of venue of trial to the High Court. The interest of justice dictated it. Without a High Court trial, justice would neither be done, nor seen as done!

Yet, Mr. Justice Wright refused the application. He did not give any reason for doing so. None was necessary. He had become part of the conspiracy to defeat justice! That was the sole reason that explains why he wanted to cover up the criminal offences committed by Lord Lester and his Gang!

FREEDOM OF SPEECH:

The law jealously protects freedom of speech. Especially freedom of the individuals to publish to the press, any misconduct, on the part of those in authorities. To that end,

Contempt of Court Act 1981 specifically provides that only the High Court, can determine whether a publication to the press, was or was not in breach of a court order. By virtue of that law, the Bar does not have the jurisdiction to punish me, before the High Court findings that I had committed a breach of a court order. In law, the Bar had to wait for the High Court to make that decision. I accordingly submitted to Mr. Justice Wright that he had, in view of the law, no alternative but to refer the case for decision by the High Court.

He refused. Again no reason was given. Again none needed to be given. It was obvious.

THE DUTY TO REPORT A CRIME:

I also drew the attention of Mr. Justice Wright to the fact that I have a legal duty to report criminal offences, which I know to have been committed. The duty is imposed by the provision of section 4(1) of the Criminal Law Act 1967. I know the law well. I am a barrister of several years standing. I know the fact of the offences committed. I had no doubt whatsoever, in my mind, that given the opportunity to prosecute Lord Lester and his Gang, before a British jury, the jury would, convict them of various offences including the offences of:

1. - Fraud.

2. - Obtaining Pecuniary Advantage by Deception contrary to section 16 of the Theft Act 1968.

3. - Perverting the Course of Justice.

4. - Subornation of Perjury contrary to section 7(1)(1) of the Perjury Act 1911.

5. - Blackmail contrary to section 21(1) of the Theft Act 1968.

Again Mr. Justice Michael Wright simply refused the application. No reason was given. No reason could be given. He knew the reason. I knew it. Such is the extent of corruption within our courts of law!

WITNESSES:

Cases are mainly proved by oral evidence of witnesses. And so, I applied to Justice Michael Wright, to order that the names of the Bar officials whom I wanted to call as my witness, be disclosed to me! He refused the application! I was not to be allowed to call any witness! Clearly, there was no longer any pretence that the judge was interested in upholding due process of law. He had nothing to fear from me. He could afford to be nakedly bias! And he was!

DISCOVERY.

Cases are also proved by documentary evidence. The law thus entitles a party to apply for disclosure to him, by the other party to the case, of the evidence he requires to prove his case. I applied for discovery of documents. It was clear that if the documents I required were disclosed to me, it would prove beyond reasonable doubt, that the case against me was a conspiracy to cover up the offences committed by Lord Lester and his Gang. Evidently, Justice Wright also knew that much. Consequently, he refused discovery! Shakespeare would have

exclaimed:

Judgement, thou art gone to brutish beast

And men have lost their reason!

LENGTH OF TRIAL:

I applied that the hearing of the case be set for 2 months. I gave notice of my intention to call all witnesses who could prove that the criminal offences I complained of were committed. The judge ruled against such proof! He set the hearing down for 2 days!

FALSE RECORD:

When the record of the hearing was distributed, I found out that all my applications pertaining to the criminal offences committed by Lord Lester and his Gang, had been left out of the record! It was a conspiracy to deny me the right of appeal on those issues. Further, it was an admission by Wright of his bias! He did not want others to know how bias he had been!

KANGAROO COURT:

The excesses of the Kangaroo Court, presided over by Mr. Justice Michael Wright, was a mixture of libertinism and ferocious cruelty. His excesses called to mind the excesses of a gang of highwaymen revelling in a pub, with tarts, on their ill-gotten gain.

That a combination of the Law Society and the Bar, could by

their halloo, make a group of judges, forget their professional duty, and behave as savage hounds, ordered to chase an innocent quarry, by heartless feudal bosses, is cause enough, to make us think hard and deep, about the need to reform our judiciary.

I have known of corrupt men who are good fathers. And corrupt ladies who are good wives. And corrupt persons who are good friends. But I cannot conceive of a corrupt judge, who deserves to be called a good father or husband! This is because the conduct of a corrupt judge violates all the criteria of judging the ultimate values of truth, justice and human brotherhood!

DECISIONS AGAINST AUTHORITIES

To sum up, there is no question that the procedure that Mr. Justice Michael Wright followed, was meant to be and was, in fact, prejudicial against me.

His decision was against a whole current of authorities. He did that which he ought never to have done. He omitted to do that which he ought ever to have done. He contravened the law of natural justice!

It must be established in the cases of judges, as it has been established in the cases of ministers, that failure or refusal to give reasons is no ground for exclusion of the court or public surveillance. As Lord Keith of Kinkel puts it:

"The only significance of the absence of reasons is that if all other known facts and circumstances appear to point

overwhelmingly in favour of a different decision, the decision-maker who gives no reasons cannot complain if the court draws the inference that he had no rational reason for the decision". (See: R. v. The Secretary of State for Trade and Industry ex parte Lonrho plc: ([1989] 1 W.L.R 525).

I cannot conceive of any harm that would have arisen by observance of due process: the right to be heard, to have disclosed to me the names of anonymous judges, the grounds for their decisions, the nature of the secret conversations and documents which took place between the Law Society officials and the Bar etc.

On the contrary, I conceive great many advantages that would have arisen:

First, justice would have appeared as being done.

Second, justice would have been done.

CHAPTER 14.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT JUDGES:

HIS HONOUR JUDGE MITCHEL

From time immemorial, man could not believe that God could be so unjust, as to burn, in hell, and for eternity, a nonentity who has stolen 2 groats, while, on the other hand, he allowed the mighty ones, who have committed terrible offences against their neighbours, to escape scot-free. Hence, man believed that there was a divine avenger who somehow, poured abominations and deadly ailments, against even the most powerful.

My belief has always been along that line. I believed that England would not allow a nonentity, charged of a minor misconduct to be severely punished, while allowing the mighty ones, to escape scot-free of the consequences of their abominable offences. This case has belied that belief. I was charged in the Disciplinary Tribunal of the Inns of Court with what is, comparatively, a minor misconduct. The officials of the Law Society who charged me, and the judges before whom they charged me, were themselves charged with the most serious offences. Yet, I was punished! My charges against my accusers and judges were simply ignored!

RACIALLY DISCRIMINATORY JUSTICE:

The essence of the charge against me was that I published to the press, confidential documents that disclosed the names of persons, exempted to practise law as solicitors! The charge was a mere technicality! The law itself, provides that the names of all persons practising law as solicitors, should not be kept secret, but must be published! All the names that I published to the press, were published in official directories open to the public! The alleged misconduct was thus nominal.

Yet, my punishment for it was severe. I was suspended from legal practice as a barrister for 12 months. And my suspension was used to deny me for 4 years, so far, admission as a solicitor! The chances is that it will be used to deny me legal practice as a solicitor for ever!

On the other hand, the charges I brought against my accusers were extremely serious. They included fraud and perjury etc. During the hearing of my case, the Law Society Solicitor, Mrs. Coles, admitted that she had committed exactly the same misconduct with which I was charged! She had disclosed to unauthorised persons, the documents that I was also charged to have disclosed to unauthorised persons! To make matters worse, unlike me, who had a legal justification for what I did, she had no legal defence whatsoever! Yet, my charges against her, and against he other colleagues, were simply ignored. Why?

I am black.

Coles is White.

So is Lester. And his Gang too.

Unfortunately, such is the kind of racially discriminatory justice that many of us now endure!

On 26/11/96 two judges were appointed to try me, for the alleged misconduct. The trial was to take place in July 1997. The judges were:

- His Honour Judge Mitchel and

- His Honour Judge Gelega King.

In addition to them, 3 other persons who were not judges, were also appointed to act as judges for the purpose of my case. They were:

- Marc Britain Esq

- Mark William James

- And a person who called himself Professor De Lord Desai!

THE DILEMMA

On 29/05/1997 I served each of them with notice of my intention to sue them. I did so with great sorrow, and very much against my will. However, as a man of conscience and an English Barrister, I had no alternative but to do so. The notice requested the 5 judges to indicate, within 10 days of the date of the notice that they had declined to act as judges in the trial against me. Unless they did so, I undertook to bring an action for injunction, in the High Court of Justice, to restrain them from acting as judges in the case.

I outlined to them the chronology of events, already given above, which forced me to bring such an action. I dwelt at some length on the nature of the evidence that the law required, as proof, that I had actually committed the alleged misconduct. In law, such evidence is called corpus delicti! I informed the judges that for 13 months, I had been asking the

Bar to produce to me the corpus delicti i.e. the confidential documents whose publication is the cause of my trial. The Bar dared not produce it! The Law Society dared not produce it! Why? Because they had found themselves in a horn of a dilemma. They had failed to resolve that dilemma.

On the one hand, those documents could only be legally produced in the High Court! But my accusers dare not go to the High Court because their crimes will be proved in the High Court!

On the other hand, those documents could not be legally produced in the Disciplinary Tribunal presided over by the 5 judges! Their production before the Disciplinary Tribunal would, itself, be contempt of court! It would call for an action for contempt of court to be brought against all the people who had conspired to have the confidential documents unlawfully published i.e. the Law Society, the Bar and the 5 Judges.

FROM THE FRYING PAN

However, after 13 months of debating the issue, the Bar and the Law Society opted against the **legal** publication to the High Court!

They opted for the **illegal** publication to the 5 judges of the Disciplinary Tribunal!

The minute they did so, they had jumped from the frying pan into the fire:

- They had committed a breach of the order of the Industrial

Tribunal. They were therefore guilty of contempt of court!

- The 5 judges who read the confidential documents knowing that they were forbidden by the order of the court from reading it, also committed contempt of court!

- My trial itself became illegal, in that, it was being conducted in contempt of court!

In any case, by virtue of the provision of Order 52 rule 1 of the Rules of the Supreme Court, the 5 judges have no jurisdiction to try contempt cases. And the charge against me was, in law and in fact, contempt of court charge!

In the same way, by virtue of the provision of the Contempt of Court Act 1981, the 5 judges have no jurisdiction to determine whether my publication of the confidential document to the press amounted to contempt of court!

JUDGE GELEGA KING

Fortunately, one of the two judges appointed to hear the case was just and honest. He was His Honour Judge Gelega King. It was clear, from his conduct, that he accepted that on the basis of the grounds given above, he did not have the jurisdiction to try the case. Consequently, he refused to attend the hearing of the case!

The remaining judge, Mr. Mitchel, and the remaining 3 members of the panel of judges insisted to attend the hearing. I accordingly brought a High Court civil action for injunction against them. The very fact that I had brought a civil suit

against them in the matter made them a party in the cause. In law they could no longer be judges in the matter. In law, they could not be judges in their own cause! But, they insisted on being judges in their own cause. Power indeed, corrupts.

When the hearing of my case opened, there was some commotion. His Honour Judge Gelega King did not turn up! His Honour Judge Mitchel lied about his failure to turn up! He said that Judge Gelega King could not come because of a case the Judge King had to hear!

MITCHEL SHUT UP

I pointed out that the refusal of Judge Gelega King to turn up had nothing to do with any case. His appointment to hear my case had been made over 6 months ago! The question of overlapping appointments did not arise. Only one question arose. The question of judicial impartiality. Gelega King knew that he would not appear to be impartial if he appeared as a judge in the case. Hence his decision not to come.

Poor Mitchel shut up.

Mitchel then opted to proceed without replacing Judge King Gelega. I objected. Counsel for the Bar, Mr. Richard Clayford, pointed out that the law provided that there had to be 5 judges.

Having been denied the right to summon witnesses, to see the documentary evidence that I required, to be legally aided, and so on, I was obliged to make long submissions on points of

law. The points are already stated above.

MORE SINNED AGAINST

Throughout the hearing, the partiality and influence of Judge Mitchel resembled that of some religious fanatics:

On the one hand, his fanatical zeal "white-washed" all that was done by the Law Society or the Bar.

On the other hand, it "black-washed" all that was done by me! Clearly his partiality was out of place in a court of law!

Apparently he felt that exhibition of such fanaticism had become a necessary tool of the trade! The more so as it was apparent, even to the deaf, that I was more sinned against than sinning!

MITCHEL'S VIEWS:

Every word I said proved that it was my accusers and my judges, not me, who were the culprit! In spite of where they were seated, yet, they were actually in the dock!

Mitchel never dared answer the points of law that I raised. Not even the points attacking his judicial bias! Nor the points of law proving that the tramp up charges against me was merely a desperate efforts, to cover up the crimes committed by Lester and his Gang! From what Mitchel said, he held two and only two views:

First that the Law Society was above the law. Cole represented the Law Society. Therefore whatever Coles said was above the law! Coles' admission of unlawful publication of the documents that I published, was deemed to be above the law! Consequently, it did not call for any comments!

Second, I was below the low. Therefore, whatever I said, was unlawful My questions as to whether I was entitled to the defence of a legal duty to report a crime, or demanding whether he could be a judge in his own cause, etc were deemed to be beyond legal requirement of giving answers!

The way he conducted the case aroused in me overwhelming repulsion and aversion. A friend of mine could not help asking about Mitchel:

Why did a wretched judge like him, last so long on the bench!

I replied:

Because he knows those who butter his bread! He is not here, because he is who he is. He is here, because his patrons are who they are!

RULING ON POINTS OF LAW:

The ruling that Judge Mitchel made, on the issue of jurisdiction, more than any conduct of his, prove, beyond reasonable doubt, his absolute bias. The following is, word by

word, his ruling:

"This is a submission by Dr. Adoko that this Tribunal should not proceed to hear the one remaining charge that he faces alleging misconduct. He has, in fact, itemised, I counted it, as in fact 14 points, why we should not proceed to hear this charge. Many of the arguments, it seemed to us, would be more relevant to the main part of the hearing itself, although we have gone to some trouble, to consider as best we can, the individual points made by Dr. Adoko.

"One of the main questions we asked ourselves was: Does misconduct necessarily amounts to contempt of court. Our answer to that was no. We are not dealing here with a contempt matter. We are dealing here as to whether there is an act or acts amounting to misconduct. We remind ourselves that where you are a member of a professional body we must enquire into your obligations imposed upon it.

"Dealing next one of the points that was raised, was the points of bias. We do not feel personally and indeed, the Doctor has said that he is not suggesting that for a moment. Nor, and this perhaps more important, do we feel bias because of the issue of a writ. We do not believe that this prevents us from exercising the jurisdiction that we have. We have no interest in these proceeding one way or another and have appropriately open minds about this particular charge and the evidence that we are no doubt to hear in connection with it. None of these submissions persuade us from dealing with the charge against us".

FAILURE TO GIVE REASONS:

Judge Mitchel admitted that I gave 14 points that show that his panel of judges, had no jurisdiction to try the case. He held that many of those points, should, however, have been used as grounds for defence. In his opinion, they did not constitute grounds for challenging jurisdiction. But, he has not even dealt with the few points, which he admits, constitute material grounds for challenging the jurisdiction! For justice to be seen as done, the law requires that the ground for rejecting each of the material points should have been given. In law, his failure to deal with those points, was an indication that he knew that, had he dealt with them, his findings would have been different. Hence, his failure to deal with the material ground for challenging his jurisdiction, was, in law, indicative of judicial bias!

DENIAL OF THE CHARGE:

The second point to note is that Judge Mitchel denied that the contempt against me was for contempt of Court! In his words:

We are not dealing here with a contempt matter.

This can only be described as a lie. And the judge knew that it was a lie! The Bar, the Law Society and the Inns of Court have all stated that we were dealing with contempt matter! In their word, we were dealing with a breach of the order of the Industrial Tribunal. In law, and in fact:

A breach of the order of the Tribunal is contempt of court.

It is nothing else!

Judge Mitchel thus lied. And Mr. Justice Potts came to know that Judge Mitchel had lied. Yet, he also tried to cover up the lie!

JUDICIAL BIAS:

The reason that Judge Mitchel gave for refusing a change of venue was equally false. And what is more, Judge Mitchel knew that it was false! The reason he gave was:

Nor, and this perhaps more important, do we feel bias because of the issue of a writ.

That was not the point of law raised. And Judge Mitchel knew that judicial bias had nothing to do with his feeling. Indeed, I quoted to him the authority which specifically pointed out that his feeling had nothing to do with it! The authority by Lord Denning specifically stated:

"The court does not look at the mind of justice itself or at the mind of the chairman of the tribunal, or whoever it may be who sits in a judicial capacity. It does not look to see if there was a real likelihood that he would, or did, in fact favour one side at the expense of the other. The Court looks at the impression that would be given to other people. Even if he was impartial as could be, nevertheless, if the right minded-persons would think that, in the circumstances there was a real likelihood of bias on his part, then he should not sit. And if he does so, then, his decision cannot stand... The court will not inquire whether

he did in fact favour one side unfairly. Suffice it that reasonable people might think he did. The reason is plain enough. Justice must be rooted in confidence: and confidence is destroyed when right-minded people go away thinking: `The Judge was bias`.

The fact that judge Mitchel deliberately gave a false excuse, which he knew to be false, proves his judicial bias.

The fact that Mr. Justice Potts opted to cover up such a clear breach of the rule of natural justice equally speaks for itself.

With a person like Judge Mitchel as the Chairman of the panel of judges, it was a foregone conclusion that the charges against me would be adjudged to have been proved! And it was so judged. It was also to be expected that the punishment against me would be stiff. And it was. I was suspended from legal practice, as a barrister, for one year! But I was, thanks to Counsel for the Bar, allowed to remain a barrister. It does not auger well for our courts, when litigants look for some sort of justice, from counsel for the opponent, rather than from the judges!

HISTORY:

To those of you who are still young, my advice is that, in addition to any professional qualification you may get, ensure that you have an academic qualification. Nobody suspends its use. Nobody takes it away. It is guaranteed to give you a title that you wear, till you die.

My second advice to you is, to know the task of an author of a

historical book. It is to concentrate solely on telling the truth! And, to tell nothing but the truth. Pleasant and unpleasant facts are narrated merely because they are true.

GETTING AWAY WITH IT!

As an author of a historical book, I am obliged to be negligent of the complaint by the like of Mitchel and Morrison. They will complain that the book does not reflect them in the best light. It is not the book that does that. The conduct of a thief, who steals, indicts the thief. In the same way, the conduct of a judge who is bias, indicts the judge. Like the policeman who arrests the thief, this book merely publishes the indictment.

My main charges against Judge Mitchel are:

- He knew that he had no jurisdiction to try my case. But, for the purpose of defeating the end of justice, he allowed himself to be used as a stooge, to try my case.

- He also knew that the accusations against me were without legal foundation. The law obliges me to report the evidence of a crime. Confidential or not, the evidence must be reported. He thus knew that the punishment that he imposed upon me was unlawful! Yet he imposed it because he knew that he could get away with it. And he has got away with it. At least, so far!

CHAPTER 15.

Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT JUDGES:

MR. JUSTICE POTTS.

The law is quite simple: a judge must not be a coward! Nor a mercenary! Nor a sycophant. I do not believe that Mr. Justice Potts is a coward, a mercenary or a sycophant. But I maintain that, throughout this case he behaved as a coward. And a mercenary. And a sycophant!

Those are very serious accusations to make about a judge. It follows that the specific grounds upon which they are based must be given. It is then for the reader to judge, whether, on the basis of those grounds, the accusations are well founded.:

COWARDICE:

The accusation of cowardice calls for some background information. I had learnt a lesson about deliberate delays to determine my cases. It was clear that the object of the undue delays, was to defeat the end of justice. The offence of publishing confidential documents that I was alleged to have committed, was a minor one. If committed by a White person, like Harriet Herman, the punishment imposed is nominal. She

is not suspended from her work as a solicitor. If committed by a Black man, it is punishable by up to 12 months suspension from legal practice!

Yet, even such open punishment is considerably kinder. It is the hidden punishment, in the form of undue delays, to make necessary decisions, which is intolerable. The Bar took over one year i.e. from 1995 to 1996, to decide that I should be charged for the misconduct of publishing confidential information! The Inns of Court then took over one year i.e. from 1996 to 1997, to decide that I be suspended, for 12 months, from legal practise, as a barrister.

I then appealed to Mr. Justice Potts. In order to avoid unnecessary delays by Mr. Justice Potts, I applied to the Court to dispense with oral hearing. I suggested that my appeal be determined, on the basis of the written pleadings, by the parties. The reply of the court was that the law does not permit determination of appeals, on the basis of written pleadings. Hence, that the appeal will be given an oral hearing. However, later, Mr. Justice Potts changed his mind! He ruled that the law permits the appeal to be determined, on the basis of paper submissions. Consequently, the parties agreed that my appeal be determined on the basis of written submissions!

Yet, Mr. Justice Potts did not fulfil the very condition for determining the appeal on paper! He allowed a whole year to pass without having determined the appeal! In the High Court, all the applications which are to be determined on paper submissions, are invariably determined within 6 weeks. The

sole object for the agreement, for the appeal to be determined on written submissions, was to enable the decision to be made within a period of 6 weeks or so!

In law, I was denied oral hearing by false pretences on the part of Mr. Justice Potts!

I am the only English Barrister, who has been denied his right of oral trial!

Why then, did the judge indulge in such a false pretence? The reason soon became clear. After a year had elapsed, he directed that the parties be asked, once more, to agree to forfeit their legal right to have the judgement delivered, in their presence, and in open court! It is generally important that judgements be delivered in open court and in the presence of the parties. In cases involving complaint of racial discrimination, as this appeal was, it is even much more important that the judgement be delivered in the presence of the parties. This is because, it gives the parties the opportunity to ask the judge to make any recommendation as to the future course of action. The Race Relations Act of 1976 specifically so provides. I would have liked to ask Mr. Justice Potts to to make a recommendation to the Law Society. Over 9 years had past since December 1989, when I applied to become a solicitor. Hence, I wanted the judge to recommend to the Law Society to expedite processing my application for admssion, in view of the number of years that it has taken!

Unfortunately, Mr. Justice Potts insisted on delivering the judgement in Leeds, in the absence of the parties! And that

was when his cowardice became apparent. He did not want to meet me! He did not want to see the face of the victim of his atrocious injustice!

All the same, after his judgement was delivered, I made a formal application to the Court. I asked Mr. Justice Potts to recommend to the Law Society to process my application for admission as a solicitor without undue delay. I stated that, in having given its judgement in Leeds, the court denied me the opportunity to ask it to make the recommendation.

MERCENARY:

Mr. Justice Potts refused to determine my application! He claimed that he no longer had jurisdiction in the matter! Yet, the law is clear. The judge who tries a case has jurisdiction to entertain applications that subsequently arise in the matter! Why then, was the judge telling such a fib? That is one of the grounds for accusing the judge, as the saying goes of having been:

Bought and pocketed!

There are much more serious grounds for the accusations.

EVASION OF CRITICAL GROUNDS OF APPEAL:

The main characteristic, typical of judges who, as the saying goes, are "bought and pocketed" is that they deliberately do not deal with certain critical grounds of appeal. Mr. Justice Potts deliberately did not deal with the 9 critical grounds of appeal that I had submitted! Had he dealt with them, as it was his duty to do, I would have won the appeal. He did not deal with them, or with any one of them, because he did not want me to win the appeal!

Why did he not determine the appeal on the merit of the grounds of appeal?

Why did he, contrary to his oath of office, evade dealing with the grounds of appeal in order to defeat the end of justice?

The only answer is that he had been "bought and pocketed", not with money, but with power or with racist appeals or with both!

The following are the 9 grounds of appeal which Mr. Justice Potts dared not deal with. Had he dealt with them, nay, had he even dealt with only one of them, I would have won the appeal!

i. The rule of natural justice: He dared not admit or deny that the orders of Mr. Justice Wright, that names of material witnesses be not disclosed to me, and that copies of material documentary evidence, be not given to me, was contrary to the rule of natural justice. Had he made the ruling on that

point of law, my appeal would have succeeded!

ii. Failure to give reasons: Again, Mr. Justice Potts dared not admit or deny that the failure of the Disciplinary Tribunal, to give reasons for rejecting my grounds of defence, was an error of law. Had he made that ruling, my appeal would have succeeded.

iii. S. 1(2) of the Tribunal of Enquiry (Evidence) Act 1922 as well as Order 52 rule 1 of the Supreme Court: Besides, Justice Potts dared not admit or deny that under the law, only the High Court has jurisdiction to determine whether I did, or did not, break the order of the Industrial Tribunal, concerning confidential documents. Had he dealt with that issue, as it was his duty to do so, he would have ruled that the Disciplinary Tribunal had no jurisdiction to determine the dispute. Consequently, he would have allowed my appeal.

iv. S. 4(1) of the Criminal Law Act 1967: Further, Mr. Justice Potts dared not admit or deny that by virtue of the law, I had a legal duty to disclose confidential documents, which prove the offences committed by Lord Lester, and his Gang. Had he made the ruling on that point of law, he would have allowed my appeal. It would have followed from that ruling that the disciplinary action taken against me, was an error in law! It was a device to cover up the offences committed by Lord Lester and his Gang.

v. Contempt of Court Act 1981: Furthermore, Mr. Justice Potts dared not admit or deny that under he provision of the law, the Disciplinary Tribunal had no jurisdiction to

determine whether the confidential documents, that I published to the press, breached the order of the court or not! In order to preserve our freedom of speech, the law specifically provides that only the High Court has such a jurisdiction. Had the judge dealt with the point of law, he would have ruled that my trial in the Disciplinary Tribunal, was a usurpation of the jurisdiction of the High Court! Hence, that it was unlawful. In the circumstances, my appeal would have succeeded.

vi. Article 14 of the European Convention: Again, Mr. Potts dared not admit or deny that my punishment, on the complaint of Mrs. Coles, for publishing confidential documents was racially discriminatory. The law is quite clear. He who comes to equity, must come with clean hands. Anne Coles confessed to the Tribunal, that she came to equity, with dirty hands! She admitted that, like me, she also had unlawfully published the same confidential documents! The law was thus quite clear. If I had to be punished, she had to be punished too. She was not punished. I was punished! Why? The only conclusion is that: She is White. I am black. No judge worthy of the name would have turned his court into a court of racial discrimination!

vii. Article 14 of the European Convention: Besides, Mr. Justice Potts dared not admit or deny that the Bar had discriminated against me on racial ground! The Bar had allowed the complaint against me, to be initiated by a letter. Yet, it refused to accept my letter, initiating a complaint against Lord Lester! Both Lester and I are English Barristers. He is junior to me. I am senior to him! The law requires the procedure for initiating complaints against all English

Barristers to be the same! Yet, the Bar insisted that the procedure be discriminatory. Why? Because Lester is White. I am Black. Potts should have ruled this racially discriminatory procedure illegal. Had he carried out his duty as a judge, he would have ruled that if a letter could not initiate a complaint against Lord Lester, then it ought not to have initiated a complaint against me. Hence my appeal would have succeeded! But Potts had turned the High Court into a racist court!

viii. Judicial Bias: Mr. Justice Potts dared not admit or deny the effect, in law, of the fact that the panel of judges in the Disciplinary Tribunal, had allowed the confidential documents to be unlawfully disclosed to them! Had he done so, he would have ruled that they had become a party to the dispute! Hence, they could no longer act as judges in their own cause!

Ix. **Rule of natural justice:** Again Mr. Justice Potts dared not admit or deny that, in law, it is against the rule of natural justice, for the panel of judges of the Disciplinary Tribunal, against whom I had brought a case for an injunction, to try me. I had brought a case for an injunction against them. The case was pending in the High Court! Had he dealt with that issue, he would have allowed my appeal.

X. No confidentiality in iniquity: Further, Mr. Justice Potts dared not admit or deny the established law that there can be no confidentiality in iniquity! This is how Lord Denning puts it:

"'There is no confidence in disclosure of iniquity'. The

public interest in disclosure outweighed the public interest in preserving confidence". (See Denning: What Nest in the Law: Butterworths: 1982 at p.240).

In law, I ought never to have been punished for disclosing documentary proof of the iniquity of Lord Lester and his Gang! The interest of public disclosure outweighed public interest of preserving confidence! Had Potts made a ruling on that point of law, I would have won the appeal!

SYCOPHANCY:

Part of the inducement to judges, to conspire to defeat, so openly, the end of justice in my case, was sycophancy. The legal profession i.e. the Bar and the Law Society, have a lot of political clout. It also has a lot of say in matters pertaining to the judiciary. Some judges thus find themselves obliged to pander to the idiosyncrasies of the legal profession. In this case, the herd instinct against a person seen as an outsider was invoked. How dare I, an outsider, come to teach the Law Society, law!

In fact, invariably, every person who deals with the Law Society finds himself teaching the Law Society, law! It is not because the staff of Law Society do not know law. It is simply that they are so much immersed in intrigues that they cannot see the law, because of the malice! Hence you do not need to know much law, to teach them the law!

The greatest causes for alarm, are judges, like Mr. Justice Potts, who are mentally subservient to the Bar and the Law Society! A person like Mr. Potts feels obliged to manipulate his judgement so as to serve the interest, not of justice, but of the Bar and the Law Society! Of course, he does not openly admit such subservience. Nor does he have to! As seen above, his judgement cries out saying:

"I am no judgement! I am a concoction!"

It is that very fact that gives such judgements their unsavoury characteristic.

Clearly, Mr. Justice Potts knew that it was judicially wrong for him to dispense, as he did, unequal justice. It has made him appear as the puppet of the Bar and the Law Society! A much junior judge than him, His Honour Judge Gelega King had refused to become the sycophant of the Bar and the Law Society!

In the Disciplinary Tribunal I congratulate myself for having had the courage to point out that:

Look at Judge Gelega King. He refused to stoop to this betrayal of justice.

None of the judges dared look me in the eyes. None dared deny the truth! None dared exonerate himself!

A FABLE:

Since he did not have the courage, of His Honour Judge Gelega King, or of His Honour Judge Altman, Mr. Justice Potts made a scarecrow of the law. His intention was to make the law look so irrational, that it was feared by the underdogs. What he did not know was that the underdogs, like the birds of prey, invariably find out the truth! Thereafter, they insult the maker of the scarecrow by perching on the scarecrow! And that is what I have done. I shook away my fear of Mr. Justice Potts. I decided to publish the injustice that he has perpetrated. This publication condemns him in no uncertain terms.

It is clear that if the example of Mr. Justice Potts, of judgement by ignoring all issues in the dispute is followed, there will be no justice! Litigants need no longer prepare grounds for their case or their appeal! Why prepare grounds of appeal, when judges do not deal with them? Why prepare points of law when judges ignore them! Judges will determine cases or appeals on the basis of whims, sycophancy, favouritism, racism, or kith and kin!

OPTING OUT OF THE JUDICIARY:

Both in criminal and civil laws, the universal law of retribution applies. Just as fire produces smoke, so does a crime produce its punishment. And just as right calls for a duty, so does infringement of right, calls for compensation.

The judgement by Potts calls for his resignation from the judiciary.

His judgement was nothing, but a fable. The explanation given in his judgement was nothing, but sophism!

Nor did Mr. Justice Potts delude himself that he had administered justice. As pointed above, his conscience could not allow him to read his judgement in my presence! How could he read the judgement that cries out, saying:

I am a lie. And the judge knows it.

With all the dishonesty and timidity that judgement by conspiracy, by yielding to the authorities, or by toeing the line, implies, a judge who indulges in it, may be taken to have opted out of the judiciary.

CHAPTER 16.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT JUDGES:

LEGAL AID BOARD & MR. JUSTICE MAURICE KAY:

The day was 18/06/1999. I had, by then, for some 6 years, appeared before one judge or another, in the cases that I

brought against the Law Society. On that day, my application for leave to apply for judicial review, of the decision of the Legal Aid Board, came for hearing before a High Court Judge, Mr. Justice Maurice Kay. My complaint was that the Legal Aid Board had, conspired with the Law Society, to defeat the end of justice, by refusing me legal aid. The High Court number of my application was: CO/29/99.

I was quite elated about the application. I had, in my hand, the evidence of a conspiracy to defeat the end of justice. This time, I had caught the Law Society red-handed.

As I watched Mr. Justice Kay dispense justice in other applications, that came before mine was called, I was impressed by his apparent impartiality. I wondered who was this judge of judges! My hopes rose high. I was convinced that he would not stoop to defeat the end of justice!

My application was made to be the last. Judge Kay, who had another pressing appointment, kept saying that he would definitely deal with my application. And that it would be the last application he dealt with. All the rest were to be adjourned. It did not strike me then that there was anything ominous in that.

At long last it was called. His glance fell on me. He smiled. He was very polite. He appeared very considerate. He invited me to go right in front of the Court. Thereafter, he asked me the grounds for my application. He had, of course already read the application.

I felt that at long last, my luck had changed! Here was a judge

who would not stoop to a conspiracy to defeat justice.

My application was very simple and straight forward. The Law Society was determined to deny me my right of legal representation, by a firm of solicitors and by counsel! They had good cause for doing so. They were sure that the judges could afford to ignore what I said, because of their conspiracy. But they were not quite sure whether the judges would equally ignore what I had to say, if said by a White Counsel! That was the issue. Therein, as Shakespeare would say, hangs a tale.

The Law Society had, literally directed the Legal Aid Board to refuse my application for legal aid! The Law Society even gave the Legal Aid Board the ground to give for refusing my application for legal aid!

Very briefly, the facts on which my case relied were as follows:

On 18 December 1995 the Law Society exempted me from sitting for the Qualified Lawyers Transfer Test in order to become a solicitor. My exemption was effected as a result of the finding by Mr. Justice Altman. Mr. Altman found that the delay to exempt me, had created the impression, that the Law Society was abusing the power of their office, by victimising me, for having sued them for racial discrimination.

Although in compliance with that finding, the Law Society was obliged to exempt me, yet, on 07/02/95 the Law Society deferred consideration of my application for admission into the Roll of Solicitors! The decision was merely a continuation of my victimisation on another ground. The ground given for

deferment of consideration was that, the Law Society had referred consideration of the issue of my conduct, to my professional body, the Bar Council.

I had disclosed to the press on 22/02/95 confidential documents showing that Lord Lester, Solicitor Robin Lewis and the Gang of Four of the Law Society had committed the offence of conspiracy to defeat the end of justice etc. Thereafter, the Law Society complained to the Bar Council, alleging that my conduct amounted to a professional misconduct. The deferment of considering my application to be admitted as a solicitor, was based on that complaint. This is how the Law Society stated the point:

"However, whilst it is for the Society to decide the issue of character and suitability, it is the Society's practice to defer such consideration where the matter is also receiving consideration from another regulatory body."

I immediately challenged the legality of the practice which deferred consideration of my application. On 23/06/98 after having tried, in vain, through other avenues to obtain redress, I applied to the Legal Aid Board to give me legal aid. I wanted legal aid to bring a suit against the Law Society for damages that I suffered, as a result of unreasonable and unlawful decision taken by the Law Society, to defer consideration of my application.

The Legal Aid Board refused my application 3 times. Each time it refused my application, I pointed out that the ground given for the decision was manifestly wrong in law. Each time

that they reconsidered either my application for review, or my appeal, they admitted that, indeed, their former decision, was manifestly an error in law! Yet, instead of giving me legal aid on the basis of such an admission, they proceeded to give new grounds for refusing me legal aid! I was ultimately forced to challenged in court, the legality of their decisions. The 3 legal grounds for the application for judicial review, were:

1. - The decision was against the rule of natural justice.

2. - The decision was a nullity because the Legal Aid judges were bias.

3. - The decision was a manifest error of law on the face of the record.

BREACH OF THE RULE OF NATURAL JUSTICE:

On 29/06/98 the Legal Aid Board refused my application for Legal Aid. It gave 2 reasons for doing so. First, it gave a formal general reason that it gives for refusing every application, namely:

"It is considered that on the information available you have no reasonable prospects of success in the proceedings".

Second, it gave a specific reason for refusing my particular

application namely:

"Given the Applicant's qualification and experience, it is considered that he is able to represent himself without recourse to legal aid funds"

On 03/07/98 I applied for a review of the decision. The ground I gave was that the decision of the Legal Aid Board was contrary to the rule of natural justice. The rule of natural justice required public servants to act fairly. The Legal Aid Board had not acted fairly, in refusing me legal aid, on the ground of my qualification and experience. This was because both, His Honour Judge Altman and the Legal Aid Board itself, had formerly held that, in spite of my qualification and experience as a barrister, yet, the nature of my complaint called for my being legally represented:

1. - His Honour Judge Altman, had made a judicial finding that I did not have sufficient knowledge in the particular sphere of law involved.

2. - The Legal Aid Board had, itself admitted that I deserved representation in the dispute. It had previously given me legal aid for the purpose.

On 01/09/98 the Legal Aid Board reviewed its former decision. This time, it admitted that the ground of my qualification and experience that it had formerly given, was wrong in law and withdrew it. It then gave a new ground for refusing my application.

I drew the attention of Mr. Justice Kay to the legal implication

of that admission. In law, it was mandatory for him to give me leave to apply for judicial review. The rule of natural justice is quite clear on that point. The law does not allow a public body to become as fickle as a Catherine wheel! It cannot go on giving one reason, admitting it to be wrong and then failing to give the remedy that the admission calls for!

Lord Hewart's adage that is often quoted explains why decisions, which are contrary to the rule of natural justice, must, of necessity, be null and void:

"It is not merely of some importance, but it is of fundamental importance that justice should not only be done but should manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done": Lord Hewart C.J. in Rex v. Sussex Justices [1924] 1 K.B. 256, 259.

JUDICIAL BIAS:

After admitting that the ground that it had formerly given for its decision was wrong, the Legal Aid Board, came up with a completely new ground for refusing legal aid. The new ground was:

"There was insufficient benefit to be gained from the proposed proceedings as they understood" that I had now retired!

The new ground was a desperate attempt, by the Legal Aid

Board, to save their face. However, as it turned out, it was comparable to a fall, from the frying pan, into the fire! And so, 05/09/98 I applied for a review of their new decision. I stated thus:

"I have retired merely because I have been refused to practice law as a solicitor. As soon as I am allowed, I will begin to do so".

The important thing to note here is that I had never told the Legal Aid Board that I had retired! I had told only the Law Society and the Master of the Rolls. The Master of the Rolls could not have told the Legal Aid Board about it. Only the Law Society could, and did tell the Legal Aid Board about it! In short, the Legal Aid Board, contrary to the laws governing the impartiality of officials engaged in quasi judicial duty, went behind my back, to ask the Law Society, to give them the reason for refusing me legal aid! And the Law Society obliged it!

The law governing judicial bias is quite clear. And Mr. Justice Maurice Kay knows it. Once it is proved that a judge was bias, then his decision is automatically a nullity!

On 05/10/98, my Counsel prepared an Opinion, which was sent to the Legal Aid Board. It pointed out that refusal to give me legal aid, on the issue of retirement, which I had never pleaded, raised the issue of judicial bias! He stressed that the bias rendered the decision made by the Legal Aid Board a nullity. Counsel quoted the precedent by Lord Denning which has already been quoted elsewhere in this book.

The proper significance of the word judicial bias, according to Lord Thankerton:

"is to denote a departure from the standard even-handed justice which the law requires from those who occupy a quasi-judicial office, such as arbitrator. The reason for this clearly is that having to adjudicate as between two or more parties, he must come to his adjudication with an independent mind, without any inclination or bias towards one side or other in the dispute": Franklin & Others v. Minister of Town and Country Planning [1948] A.C. 87; [1947] 2 All E.R. 285; [1947] L.J.R. 1440.

MISTAKE OF LAW ON THE FACE OF THE RECORD:

On 08/10/98, the Legal Aid Board, once more, accepted that the ground of my retirement, which they had raised, was an error of law! Again, instead of giving me legal aid, in accordance with its admission, the Legal Aid Board again looked for yet, another ground for refusing to give me legal aid! The new ground that it gave was:

"there was no reasonable prospects for success in the proceedings, notwithstanding Counsel's advice of 5/10/98". The Legal Aid Board then falsely claimed that "It was not shown that the decision complained of was irrational, illegal, or procedurally improper".

The reason given, was a manifest error of law on the face of

the record! I had specifically shown that the practice of the Law Society, which was to be the cause of my action, was "irrational, illegal, or procedurally improper". The reasons I gave, were so strong, that my case was bound to succeed. They were:

1. - BREACH OF REGULATION 6:

The decision of the Law Society was manifestly in breach of Regulation 6 of Admission Regulation. The regulation provides that, where the issue of character and suitability for admission is concerned, the Law Society should, itself, decide the issue. Indeed, the Law Society itself admitted the point thus:

"Where there is a complaint " relating to the character and suitability of the Applicant for admission, it falls to the Society to determine the matter".

The alleged practice of the Law Society, for deferring consideration of my application for admission, in so far that it required another body, not authorised by law, to determine the issue first, was not lawful.

1. - RACE RELATIONS ACT 1976:

I had cause to be worried about the Law Society's practice. The Law Society had admitted, that on the basis of its so-called guidelines, it had treated me differently with regard to my exemption for admission as a solicitor. It further admitted that my different treatment was racially discriminatory against me. History was again repeating itself. The Law Society was

again treating me differently from other exempted barristers applying for admission. This time, the excuse for the different treatment, was no longer a "guideline" but "practice". Again the Law Society admitted openly that I was being treated differently compared to other exempted candidates for exemption. Clearly, the different treatment was again racially discriminatory!

2. DEFERMENT WAS UNREASONABLE & UNFAIR:

As a result of the deferment, it took the Bar Council one year before it referred the complaint to the Disciplinary Tribunal of the Inns of Court! And it took the Disciplinary Tribunal over a year before it heard the complaint. Yet, the Law Society has always maintained that the complaint that it made against me, was essentially the same as the one it had made against Hon. Harriet Herman M.P. Though, it found Hon. Harriet Herman, to have breached the rule of confidentiality, yet, she was not denied legal practice as a solicitor. As a result of the deferment, I had, at the time that I applied for legal aid, been denied legal practice as a solicitor for more than 3 years! The delay caused by deferment, has resulted in a far worse punishment than the so-called misconduct called for. It was thus manifestly unreasonable and unfair.

3. BREACH OF UNDERTAKING:

The Law Society has breached the firm undertaking that it gave in its letter deferring consideration of my application for admission. The undertaking stated:

"I will arrange for your application for admission to be

considered further by the Transfer Casework Committee of the Council as soon as the General of the Bar has finished its consideration of Mrs. Cole's complaint".

The General Council of the Bar finished consideration of Mrs Cole's complaint in 1996. Yet, 3 years later, by the time my application came for hearing by Mr. Justice Kay, the Law Society had not, contrary to its undertaking, considered my application for admission! At the time of writing this chapter, October 999, the Law society has not yet considered my application!

4. REFUSAL TO CARRY OUT A PUBLIC FUNCTION:

The Law Society is a public body whose reason for existence includes, amongst others, processing the application of applicants for admission to the Rolls of Solicitors. Contrary to its raison d'etre, the Law Society has refused to answer all letters, written by me, pertaining to my admission. It had also, at the time I went to court, refused to answer all letters, written by other public bodies, entreating it to perform the function of its office, by dealing with my admission! It refused to answer, for instance, the letters I showed to Mr. Justice Kay i.e. the letters from Councillor Langley, as well as the letter from Bromley Racial Equality Council.

(After the court, a strange thing happened! The letters, copies of which were given to Mr. Justice Kay, were promptly answered by the Law Society! The letters of both Mr. Langley and Bromley Racial Equality! Clearly, the Law Society was given a nudge by somebody!)

After I had completed my submission, Mr. Justice Kay asked me to take my seat. I sat down and waited for his decision. He had been a very attentive listener. My mind had associated both, his title and his person, with independence and impartiality of the judiciary. Imagine how great was my surprise, when, in his determination, he did not say a word on the 3 points of law that I raised! Not a word about:

- The rule of natural justice!

- Judicial bias!

- And error of law on the face of the record!

Nor did he say one word about the grounds for my challenging the practice of the Law Society i.e.:

- Breach of Regulation 6!

- Deferment amounted to racial discrimination!

- Deferment being unreasonable and unfair!

- Breach of undertaking!

- Refusal to carry out a public functionr!

He ruled that my case was, he said, not arguable! Had he dealt with the ground of the application, instead of his reliance on some secret briefings, his conclusion would have been very different.

All the same, his conduct made me grasp the hollowness and

futility of fighting against the Law Society!

Contrary to my expectation, Maurice Kay turned out to be a grotesque puppet, pushed to and fro, by the will of the Law Society!

When a judge turns puppet, it is not really his victim that he destroys. No.

I still had my independence and my integrity.

He has not!

I still had my conscience.

He has no conscience!

From thence henceforth, he was seen for a person he is: a hollow, posing caricature of a judge! He was a judge who had done what the Law Society wanted him to do. It occurred to me that, perhaps, his robe befitted him:

A dirty task calls for some sort of a mask.

The mask fitted Maurice Kay well. His has, indeed, been a dirty task:

He had deliberately defeated the end of justice.

He had deliberately denied me legal representation.

Lord Denning was very clear on the role of legal

representation, in the due process of justice. He held that:

Natural justice required that in serious matters, affecting a man's reputation or livelihood, or matters of serious purport, he should, if he wished, be legally represented.

My case affected my livelihood. Further, it dealt with matters of serious purport, namely, abuse of power of a public office!

CHAPTER 17.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT JUDGES:

OFFICE FOR THE SUPERVISION OF SOLICITORS

A few years ago, the Solicitors Complaints Bureau, which used to investigate and determine complaints against solicitors, was abolished. It had ceased to be independent! It was no longer impartial! It had become some sort of a hound to the Law Society! Like a hound, it was being ordered by the Law Society to chase and catch a quarry, in the persons of solicitors who did not see eye to eye with the Law Society! It had, in law become too corrupt. Justice was not being done. Nor was it being seen, as done.

And so, in its place, the Office for the Supervision of Solicitors (OSS) was established. History has again repeated itself. The OSS has become equally corrupt. It is even worse, than the Solicitors Complaints Bureau! It has become a wolf in sheep's clothing. The evidence in this book, proves its corruption beyond all reasonable doubt!

Its modus operandi for corruption is one, and only one! Whenever assigned, by the Law Society, the task of destroying a particular lawyer, it does so, by reliance the motto of the sphinx, with a difference:

It sees no virtue! It hears no virtue! It speaks no virtue.

In accordance with that motto, it has devised its reply to all the grounds of defences pleaded by the quarry to complaints in which the Law Society has expressed interest! The reply is:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

The sum total of that reply is:

- We have not seen your grounds of defence!

- We have not heard your grounds of defence!

- We cannot reasonably comment on your ground of defence!

As was to be expected, the Law Society was sure to cause me to be reported to such a bogus judge! I was reported to the

OSS for having written an article on the Internet! The article exposed the most corrupt accountant, Mr. Michael Lygo, Chief Accountant of the Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children! It accused him of embezzling, with immunity, public funds for sick children!

Lygo is an expert at using public money to bribe officials. None who reads the judgement of the OSS can fail to suspect that public money was used to bribe somebody. There can be no other rational explanation!

It is thus necessary that the reader should first know the content of the article that I published over the Internet in order to understand:

1. - How I came to be reported to the OSS.

2. - The nature of the complaint made against me.

3. - My 16 grounds of defences.

4. - How the OSS dismissed each of the ground of

defence with its unaccepted judicially biased

standard formulae:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

5. - The legal interpretation of the biased formula in the context of each ground of defence.

MASSIVE SWINDLING OF PUBLIC MONEY!

I had brought a case of racial discrimination, against the Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children, on behalf of an African nurse, Mrs. Munisi. I won the case. Compensation was paid. And a consent judgement entered.

Mrs. Munisi told her Asian friend about it. The friend was Mrs. Mumtaz DaCunha, who was the Payment Manager of the Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children. In her turn, Mrs. DaCunha also instructed me, not as a barrister or as a person employed by a solicitor, but as Dr. Adoko, a former barrister with a doctorate degree in law. She asked me to bring, on her behalf, a case of racial discrimination, against her former employer, the Great Ormond Street Hospital. I studied the facts of the case. Briefly, they were as follows:

On 01/11/95, after he had learnt that the Payments Manager of the Great Ormond Hospital, Mrs. Mumtaz DaCunha, had accumulated evidence of his systematic embezzlement of public funds, Mr. Michael Lygo, decided to get rid of Mrs. DaCunha from the Hospital. He advised her to resign voluntarily from the Hospital. He impressed upon her that if she agreed to do so, she would be paid a lump sum of money equal to her 12 months salary, with tax, plus monthly salary for about 3 months. However, if she refused to do so, disciplinary action would be taken against her. It would end in her dismissal! She would also lose all her entitlements to

benefits.

On the same day, Assistant Director of Personnel, Ms. Jessica Wood, advised Mrs. DaCunha that it would be disastrous for her to refuse the offer of resignation, made to her, by Michael Lygo! Ms. Wood stressed that Michael Lygo was:

"Very powerful and had very strong support from the Union".

On 03/11/95 Mr. Michael Lygo wrote a letter to Mrs. DaCunha. It ordered Mrs. DaCunha to attend a meeting on 13/11/95. The express purpose of the meeting was to dismiss Mrs. DaCunha!

On the same day, Mr. Peter Walliston, the Trade Union Representative advised tearful DaCunha, that it was in her best interest to resign! He pointed out that Michael Lygo would make her life hell! He also advised her to ensure that her letter of resignation did not contain the word resignation. Instead, it was to contain words to the effect that she had been forced out of her employment.

On 08/11/95, in accordance with the advice given, by her Trade Union Representative, Mrs. DaCunha wrote a letter to the Hospital. It stated that she was not resigning from the Hospital, but that she had been forced out of her employment. She confessed that she had been left with no alternative but to terminate her employment, and to accept the benefits offered her.

On 14/11/95 Michael Lygo, signed the form terminating

DaCunha's employment. He wrote down the cause of termination as:

"New Job"!

It was a lie!

On 24/11/95 Michael Lygo, wrote a letter to DaCunha wishing her:

"Success in search of a new position".

It was a written admission that the official excuse that he had given, was a lie.

Lygo certainly had cause to worry about DaCunha. She was conversant about Lygo's fraudulent accounting! DaCunha had never concealed her objection to that kind of accounting! Yet, in spite of her objection, Mr. Lygo had ordered that invalid cheques, signed by one signatory, instead of the required 2 signatories, be sent to various customers! It was well known that those cheques would not be honoured! The cheques involved were many, and their value was about a million pounds!

The cheques were made purportedly for goods bought and supplied. In fact no goods, worth the amount of money on the cheques, had been bought and supplied! Nor were there any delivery notes for the alleged goods! As DaCunha put it:

The sole object of the cheques was to deceive external auditors that the income received for the financial year

had all been used, by the end of the financial year! As a result of the fraudulent accounting, the impress sheet, upon which the external auditors gave their clearance, succeeded to create the false impression, that it was intended to create, namely, that all the incomes received had been expended!

Then, after the external auditors had gone, Michael Lygo caused all the companies to whom the false cheques had been sent, to return the cheques! The cheques were returned, allegedly for the purpose of having the second authorized signature, appended on them. In fact however, that was never the intention. And, it was not done! Instead, new cheques, for a new financial year, and for smaller amounts of money, were issued!

Lygo's misconduct did not end with fraudulent accounting alone. It extended to embezzlement of public funds too! He embezzled the funds of the Great Ormond Street Hospital, for which he was the trustee!

Again, DaCunha had objected strongly about Lygo's thefts of public money! Big sums of money were stolen from the Hospital to pay to certain members of the staff, such as Jackie Ross, Christine Monk, Tolu Cliffe, and Mary Paul and, of course, to Lygo himself!

The false reason given by Lygo, to cover up the theft was that it was in lieu of leave! In fact, it was in addition to the holidays already taken by the 4 members of the staff as well as by Lygo!

When confronted, by DaCunha, about this embezzlement of public money, Lygo was forced to make a confession. He admitted that the payment was wrong! And promised that it would never happen again! It was, he said:

"A one-off payment"!

Before I made public, the thefts of public funds by Michael Lygo, I demanded that the Chief Executive, of the Great Ormond Street Hospital, Mr. Robert Creighton, should cause necessary investigation to be carried into the complaint.

The more so as the sworn affidavit by Mr. John Hennesey, the Director of Finance for the Great Ormond Street Hospital, was an admission that Lygo is a thief!

a.) Hennesey admits that on 31/03/95 Lygo caused 14 cheques for a sum of £773,022.09 to be written.

b.) He does not dispute the fact that the false cheques were conveniently posted, just before the arrival of external auditors.

c.) Nor does he dispute that the false cheques were recalled immediately, after the auditors had left!

d.) Nor does he dispute that prior to Mr. Lygo's advent into the administration of the Hospital finances, no such incident involving so many invalid cheques, had ever taken place.

e.) Indeed, Hennesey dared not dispute any of the incriminating facts about the cheques. For instance, although I

had specifically pleaded it, yet, Hennesey dared not dispute the fact that though all the false cheques bear the same date, yet, the cheques were not in consecutive order! They were interposed, here and there, by cheques, which bear different dates!

f.) Nor did he challenge the fact that although all the false cheques were returned for the purpose of obtaining a second signatory endorsed thereon, yet the second signatures were not endorsed thereon!

g.) Instead Michael Lygo ordered that all the false cheques be cancelled!

h.) Nor did Hennesey dispute the fact that on the order of Lygo, new cheques bearing the dates for the new financial year, were issued.

i.) Above all, he also dared not deny the confession made by Lygo, at the material time, that the object of the exercise was for the consumption of the external auditors!

j.) It is significant that none of the 4 beneficiaries of Lygo's theft was made to deny the truthfulness of the accusation. Nor dare Lygo himself do that. He dares not even deny his confession that it would remain a one-off thing!

Again, before I made the theft of Lygo public, I reported the theft to the Crown Prosecution Service. It refused, on a technical ground, to carry out the necessary investigations! It stated that it had no jurisdiction to carry out necessary investigations! In their letter of 11 July 1997 reference

number CSDX/426/97, they stated:

"The Crown Prosecution Service plays no part in the investigation and will only advise on whether or not to commence a prosecution if a police file is submitted to it"!

Thereafter, in accordance with the duty that the law imposes upon all law abiding persons, I published, on the Internet news, and on the Internet, **Anti-Sleaze Magazine**, the crimes committed by Chief Accountant Michael Lygo.

THE RUNNING DOGS OF THE MOST CORRUPT:

Many persons congratulated me for exposing such a sinister corruption. There was one exception. It was Marshall Rice, who calls himself some sort of a barrister! However, he has deservedly earned the nickname of The Running Dogs of the Most Corrupt. As usual, Rice plied his trade of ignoring massive evidence of corruption!

LYGO GIVES NOTICE TO SUE FOR LIBEL

In a letter dated 04/09/97 Michael Lygo, through his Solicitors, Madden Solicitors of Claremont Chambers, 6-8 Claremont Road, Surrey, gave me notice of his intention to sue me for libel! The case was to be before a British jury! It was the joke of the year! Lygo also demanded immediate

retraction of the defamatory accusations that I made against him.

Within 30 minutes of the receipt of the notice of intention to sue, I faxed to him a reply to his letter. It stated that Attanayake & Co. Solicitors had received instructions to accept, on my behalf, service of a Writ for libel that he was to issue.

As was to be expected, the notice of intention to sue turned out to have been a hoax! No libel action was brought. None is expected!

FIELD FISHER WATERHOUSE SOLICITORS:

On behalf of the Chief Executive of the Great Ormond Street Hospital, Field Fisher Waterhouse Solicitors, the most powerful firm of solicitors in the United Kingdom, were more conciliatory. Their letter contained an indirect admission that the complaint was not without some foundation! They pointed out that the Hospital itself, had learnt about it, and had caused it to be investigated. Their fax and letter sent on 02/09/97 stated:

1. "We are instructed that the allegations made in your letter dated the 16 April 1997 have been investigated.

1.1. "They were investigated by the London Postgraduate Hospitals Audit Consortium, which was formed by six

London based NHS hospitals to provide internal audit services. The Chairman of the Trust Audit Committee was made aware of the allegations. The result of the investigation were reviewed by District Audit . The latter is an independent body of external auditors appointed by and accountable to the Audit Commission. The allegations and the result of the investigation were discussed at the Trust Audit Committee. The Audit Committee was attended by the representatives of the London Postgraduate Hospitals Audit Consortium, a representative of the District Audit and members of the Trust's Board.

1.2. "All subsequent allegations have been investigated by the London Postgraduate Hospitals Audit Consortium and Discussed with District Audit.

1.3. "The investigations have found there to be no substance in any of the allegations of theft, fraudulent accounting, defrauding the Trust or embezzlement of public funds, which have been made against the Trust and/or Mr. Lygo.

1.4. "We assume this meets your request for investigation (and that Dr. Adoko will withdraw his allegations)".

OPINIONS OF ACCOUNTANTS:

The dispute would have ended there. However, as Managing Editor of the Anti-Sleaze Magazine, I had carried out necessary investigations into the matter. It led to very

different conclusions. I had asked for the opinions of two accountants and a barrister thus:

Does the evidence given above constitute a reasonable ground for demanding a public inquiry, into financial administration of the Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children?

The Opinions of the Accountants were that the explanation given by the Hospital was, on the face of the record, manifestly not true! They said:

If there had, indeed, been an investigation by qualified accountants, as the Great Ormond Street Hospital had claimed, then the Financial Statement for the Year ending in April 1995 would have, in accordance with the mandatory requirements of the law, been amended! It would have been amended to reflect a true and fair view of the finances of the Hospital for the financial year. Yet, it was not amended! The Financial Statement continues to reflect, as a true and fair, a financial state that is admitted to have been invalidated by Lygo's Manipulative, or Creative, or Window Dressing Accounting!

OPINIONS OF COUNSEL:

The Opinion of Counsel was equally that the explanation given by the Hospital was, manifestly an error of law, on the face of the record:

The evidence that tends to prove that Lygo was involved in fraudulent accounting, and embezzlement of public funds, is

overwhelming. If it had been put before an impartial investigators as Robert Creighton had claimed, they would not have made the findings that they were alleged to have made, namely that the accusations were baseless!

OPINIONS OF COUNSEL & ACCOUNTANTS:

In the opinion of Counsel and the Accountants, the conclusion reached by the investigators was invalid. This was because the so-called investigators had, either in law, or in the rules of accounts, no locus standi to carry out the investigation:

The London Postgraduate Hospitals Audit Consortium, which investigated the complaint were in law, as well as in the rules of accounts, neither independent nor impartial. They were judges in their own causes!

To make matters worse, it soon became clear that the so-called investigation was so haphazard that, it could never have unearthed the truth:

1. The 10 witnesses who alone could have given them the facts about the complaint, were not made to testify!

2. The summary of evidence which would have assisted the investigators to dig out the truth, was not made available to them!

AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT:

To sum up, both the Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children and I, agreed that the complaints of theft and fraud

committed by Mr. Lygo, warranted official investigations.

The sole point on which we disagreed, was whether the investigations so far effected was, or was not, fundamentally flawed. I held that it was fundamentally flawed on 4 grounds given above:

- The Charity Commissioners had certified that the Financial Statement of the Great Ormond Street Hospital for the year ending 1995, admitted to have been grossly wrong, has not been amended as required by law!

- The persons who had carried out the investigation into the complaint were judges in their own cause.

- The 10 material witnesses whose evidence would prove the offences were not made to testify before the invesitgators.

· The summary of evidence that indicates that the offences had been committed, was not made available to the investigators.

OFFENCES COMMITTED BY LYGO.

The exact offences committed by Lygo are:

1. The offence of theft. More specifically, the offence of Obtaining Pecuniary Advantage by Deception contrary to section 16 of the Theft Act 1968.

2. The offence of Fraud. More specifically, the offence of Fraudulent Management contrary to section 458 of the Companies Act 1985.

3. The offence of false accounting. More specifically, failure to Keep Correct Accounting Record contrary to section 221(1) of the Companies Act 1985.

PARTICULARS OF OFFENCE OF THEFT:

In his capacity as Financial Controller of the Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children, Michael Lygo dishonestly, with a view to gain, obtained for himself, from the Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children, pecuniary advantage which he referred to as salary in lieu of leave, whereas he had actually taken leave due to him!

PARTICULARS OF LYGO'S FRAUD.

In his capacity as Financial Controller of the Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children, Michael Lygo fraudulently paid to his cronies, such as, for instance, Christine Monk, Jackie Ross, Mary Paul and Tolu Cliffe, double salaries on the false pretence that they had not taken their leave, whereas, in fact, they had already taken their leave!

PARTICULARS OF LYGO'S FALSE ACCOUNTING.

In his capacity as the Financial Controller of the Great Ormond Street Hospital for children, with intent to cheat the financiers of the Hospital, Michael Lygo falsely wrote 14 cheques for a sum of £773,022.09, which he claimed was used by the Hospital, whereas the Hospital had not used a penny of that money!

FURTHER PARTICULARS OF LYGO'S FALSE

ACCOUNTING.

Again, in his capacity as the Financial Controller of the Great Ormond Street Hospital, with intent to deceive members of the said Hospital, Michael Lygo falsely induced the auditors to publish in the financial statement of the Great Ormond Street Hospital for the year ending in April 1995 that a sum of £773,022.09 for which he had issued 14 cheques, were spent in financial year 1994/1995, in fact, it was not the case.

NAMES OF 10 WITNESSES.

The following 10 persons, whose evidence under oath, will prove beyond reasonable doubt that Michael Lygo is a Thief and a Fraud are:

a. Mr. Michael Lygo

b. Ms. Jackie Ross

c. Ms. Christine Monk

d. Mr. Tolu Cliffe

e. Ms. Mary Paul

f. Mrs. Mumtaz DaCunha

g. Mr. Perry Kichinsky

h. Mr. Steve McDonald

i. Ms. Jessica Wood

j. Mr. David Newton

GIST OF THE EVIDENCE THAT EACH WITNESS WOULD GIVE.

- Clearly the culprits, Jackie Ross, Christine Monk, Mary Paul, Tolu Cliffe and, even Michael Lygo himself, will admit the payment. Subsequently, the payment became public knowledge and confessions were made which can no longer be retracted!

- Mr. Perry Kichinsky, the Union Steward was the first person to tell Mumtaz DaCunha, the Payments Manager of the Great Ormond Street Hospital, that she had been unfairly treated in that all her colleagues in the Finance Department, namely, Jackie Ross, Christine Monk, Tolu Cliffe, Mary Paul and Michael Lygo had been paid double salaries!

- Mr. Steve McDonald exclaimed about the theft to Mrs. DaCunha:

"How did you find out? " It is the truth". He also commented, "It really stinks"!

- Michael Lygo, when confronted by DaCunha, about the theft, exclaimed:

"Who told you about it "I'll tell you one thing. It's a one off thing. It is a gift to us. It's authorised by David

Newton"!

- Mrs. Jessica Wood, Assistant Director of Finance, admitted that what had happened was not right. She did so after learning that it was Perry Kichinsky, who had let the cat out of the bag. She also observed that it was not right.

THE HUNTING FOR A DEAF AND BLIND COURT:

In the face of this open and shut case of theft and false accounting, against Mr. Lygo, he dared not bring a libel suit against me. And so, he began a hunt for a deaf and blind court! A court that specializes in ignoring all defences given by blacklisted lawyers! He managed to learn that there was such a court. A court that harbours thieves and fraudsters. And he was apparently advised to try the Office for the Supervision of Solicitors. It is also clear that he was not advised by his own solicitors who insisted, that the decent thing was to bring a suit for libel. It is easy to see the kind of solicitors and the kind of barristers who did advise him to resort to the OSS!

THE NATURE OF THE COMPLAINT

According to OSS, the nature of the complaint against me is that:

On 6 July 1997, Dr. Adoko had published on the internet an article under the title, "Great Ormond Street Hospital accused of theft". The article made allegations of theft and false accounting against Mr. Lygo. Subsequently, Dr. Adoko had, in August of 1997 sent copies of a 12-page booklet entitled, "Sleaze in the Great Ormond Street" to directors of the

hospital trust. Mr. Lygo considered the material published by Dr. Adoko to be defamatory and improper"!

In theory, the OSS is supposed to be independent of the Law Society. In fact, it is not. It is clear from the letters that the Law Society has written to me, that the OSS was merely an instrument being used by the Law Society! Its assignment was to supply the Law Society with an excuse to justify refusing me admission as a solicitor! And so, although the OSS purports that the investigations were confidential, yet all the papers pertaining to its investigation of Lygo's complaint against me, were being sent to the Law Society! The Law Society needed the corrupt decisions to use to prevent me from being admitted as a solicitor!

The false reason given by the OSS for investigating the matter, instead of the jury was that:

"Although the material had been published by Dr. Adoko in his personal capacity, much of the information contained within both, the article and the booklet was only in his possession by virtue of his employment as a clerk with Attanayake & Co"!

MY DEFENCES AND THE OSS STANDARD ANSWERS

I gave in all 16 grounds of defence to the complaint. Yet, not one of them was dealt with on its merit! Each and every one of them was rejected on the basis of the OSS standard answer!

1. SOURCE OF INFORMATION:A MISTAKE OF FACT.

My first defence was that the basis of the complaint against me, was a mistake of fact. It was not true that "much of the information contained within both the article and the booklet" was in my possession by virtue of being employed in Attanayake and Co. Solicitors. I pointed out that as a matter of fact, I was briefed, in my personal capacity, to bring a case in the Industrial Tribunal. I was not briefed as an employee of Attanayake & co! I did not therefore get the information by virtue of being employed by Attanayake and Co. On the contrary, after I had decided not to bring a case in the Industrial Tribunal, it was I, who referred the case to Attanayake and Co. Solicitor Attanayake himself corroborated this point. The OSS itself has not challenged that point! Yet the OSS answer on that ground was:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission, on its part, that it did not care a hoot whether "much of the information contained within both the article and the booklet" had been obtained not through the Attanayake & Co. Hence, that the name of Attanayake & Co. was falsely used as an excuse for punishing me! In short it is an admission of judicial and personal bias.

2. EMPLOYMENT AS A CLERK:

The complaint was made against me under the provision of law applicable to persons employed by solicitors as clerks. The provision does not apply to persons employed as

consultants. I testified that I was employed by Attanayake & Co. as a Legal Consultant. Attanayake also testified that I was never employed as a clerk but as a Legal Consultant. Evidence was given to OSS showing that I had been employed as legal consultant by several firms of English solicitors including Kumars Solicitors, Singh & Garland Wells Solicitors and St. Johns Solicitors. The OSS admits that point. Yet, their finding on that ground was:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission, on its part, that it did not care a hoot whether I was actually employed as a legal consultant. Hence that the title clerk had been falsely used as an excuse for punishing me! In short, it is an admission of judicial and personal bias.

3. DENIAL OF FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION:

The complaint sought to have me punished, for the exercise of my fundamental right to publish an article which "made allegations of theft and false accounting against Mr. Lygo". It is therefore contrary to the provision of Article 10 of Schedule 1 of Human Rights Act 1998, which provides that "Everyone has the right of freedom of expression". The OSS does not deny my freedom of expression! Yet its answer on that ground of defence was: :

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission, on its part, that it did not care committing a breach of the law that protects freedom of speech! It is an admission of its judicial and personal bias.

4. LEGAL DUTY TO REPORT A CRIME:

The complaint sought to have me punished for reporting the offences committed by Michael Lygo. It is therefore contrary to the provision of s.4 of the Criminal Law Act 1967 which imposes upon all persons, the duty to report arrestable offence committed. The OSS does not deny that legal duty. Yet its finding on that ground remains:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission, on its part, that it did not does not want crimes reported! It is an admission that it is abusing the power of a public office to harbour criminals and to punish innocent persons! It is also an admission of its judicial and personal bias.

5. JURISDICTION FOR DEFAMATION:

The complaint of Lygo discloses only one cause of action, namely, defamation. OSS has no jurisdiction in defamation cases. The OSS does not deny that ground of defence. Yet, its finding is:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the

ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission, on its part, that, owing to a hidden agenda, it is usurping the jurisdiction that belongs to the jury. It is also an admission of its judicial and personal bias.

6. JURISDICTION TO TRY HUMAN RIGHTS CASES:

Article 6 of Schedule 1 of Human Right Act 1998 provides that in the determination of civil rights, in this case, my right to freedom of expression, everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing. The complaint calls for a court which would be able to determine whether Lygo has committed the offences I complained of or not. The OSS does not have that jurisdiction. The OSS has not challenged the validity of that defence. But its decision on that ground is:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission, on its part, that, owing to a hidden agenda, it is defying the provision of the laws governing protection of human rights! It is also an admission of its judicial and personal bias.

7. CIRCUMNAVIGATION OF THE LAW!:

The sole reason, given by Lygo, for his complaint to the OSS, is that he was circumnavigating, because he cannot afford the cost of a libel suit in the High Court!

- "I have been advised by my Solicitors of the potential remedies open to me but do not feel that these are appropriate, or cost effective, due to the high cost involved in any defamation action".

In spite of that admission, of being forced to go to a wrong court, the finding of the OSS still remains:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission, on its part, that, because of a hidden agenda, it was making itself a party to breaking the law of the land! . It is also an admission of its judicial and personal bias.

8. OSS HAS NO RELIEF:

It is clear from the complaint of Lygo that the OSS cannot provide him with the relief that he is seeking! This is how he puts his case:

"Dr. Adoko had published on the World Wide Web an article which was found at http:// www.DRADOKO@COMPUSERVE.COM under the title "Great Ormond Street Hospital accused of Theft" and I understand was lodged on Sunday 6 July 1997. I have now learnt that this has been viewed by a number of organisations".

In the circumstances, only a libel action in the High Court can clear the name Lygo before "a number of organizations"

which "viewed" the article! The OSS cannot do that. The OSS does not deny that defence. Yet its decision on it is:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission, on its part, that, because of a hidden agenda, it is prepared to defy the law regarding legal remedy for libel cases! . It is also an admission of its judicial and personal bias.

09. ADMISSION THAT I HAD GOOD GROUND TO PUBLISH THE ARTICLE:

As is seen above, the employer of Mr. Lygo, the Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children, has admitted that I had good grounds to complain against the conduct of Mr. Lygo! It is therefore quite unreasonable for a public body, to insist on punishing me for being public spirited in demanding investigations of crimes committed. The OSS does not deny this ground. But its finding is:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission, on its part, that, because of a hidden agenda, its conduct falls within the Wednesbury unreasonableness! It is prepared to intervene to prevent investigation of criminal offences, even when a public body concerned, admits that there are reasonable grounds to justify investigations! . It is also an

admission of its judicial and personal bias.

10. CONFIDENTIALITY DUTY NOT OWED TO LYGO:

Even if the information that I used to make the accusations, were obtained from "a client of Attanayake & Co", as the OSS claims, Lygo would still have no cause of complaint! This is because I owed the duty of confidentiality to the Client of Attanayake & Co but not to Mr. Lygo! I owed no duty at all to Lygo. He therefore had no locus standi to complain against me, as he has done, for a breach of confidentiality! Principle 16.01 in the Guide to Professional Conduct of Solicitors, 6th. Edition provides:

"A solicitor is under a duty to keep confidential to himself or her firm the affairs of clients and to ensure that the staff do the same".

The OSS does not deny that I do not owe Lygo a duty. Yet its conclusion was:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission that, because of its hidden agenda, it has resorted to conduct that falls within the Wednesbury unreasonableness! It is seeking to punish me for a breach of confidentiality where the law specifically provides that there is no duty of confidentiality! It is also an admission of its judicial and personal bias.

11. PUBLICATION OF WHAT WAS HEARD IN OPEN COURT!

What was published was heard in open court. The complaint thus amounts to a contempt of court. By virtue of the provision of Contempt of Court Act 1981 OSS has no jurisdiction in the matter. Only the High Court has. OSS does not deny this point. Yet its conclusion is:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission, on its part, that, because of a hidden agenda, it defies the provision of the Contempt of Court Act 1981! It is also an admission of its judicial and personal bias.

12. NO CONFIDENTIALITY IN PUBLISHING INIQUITY!

In any case, in law, the only issue that arises in publishing a crime is whether the accusations are true or not. As Lord Denning puts it:

"'There is no confidence in disclosure of iniquity'. The public interest in disclosure outweighed the public interest in preserving confidence". (See Denning: What Nest in the Law: Butterworths: 1982 at p.240).

The OSS does not deny that ground of defence. Yet its conclusion on that ground of defence remains:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the

ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission, on its part, that, because of a hidden agenda, contrary to the law, the OSS maintains that there is confidence in iniquity! It is also an admission of its judicial and personal bias.

13. INDEPENDENCE AND INTEGRITY:

In any case, the publication of the accusation of theft and false accounting was in compliance with Rule 1(a) of Solicitors Practising Rule 1990. It obliges solicitors and their staff to uphold **"the solicitor's independence and integrity"**. My integrity dictated that I continue to demand that the flawed investigations into the offences of embezzlement of public funds by the Complainant, should be re-opened so that it receives material evidence that was never put to it. The OSS does not dispute that point of law. Yet, its finding is:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission, on its part, that solicitors must behave as persons without integrity i.e. persons who harbour criminals! The case against me is that I did not harbour Lygo! There is not any other case! The decision is also an admission of bias on the part of OSS.

14. BEST INTEREST OF THE CLIENT: Publication of the accusations of theft and false accounting was also in compliance with Rule 1© of Solicitors Practising Rule 1990. It obliges solicitors and their staff to **"act in the best interest**

of client". The best interest of the client was to have the truth of the allegations investigated. The OSS does not dispute that point. But its conclusion still remains:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission, on its part, that, because of its hidden agenda, a solicitor should not act in the best interest of his client! It is also an admission of its judicial and personal bias!

15. THE GOOD REPUTE OF SOLICITOR'S PROFESSION:

Publication of the accusations of theft and false accounting was also in compliance with Rule 1(d) of Solicitors Practising Rule 1990. It obliges solicitors and their staff to act in a way that promotes **"the good repute of the solicitors' profession"**. The good repute of the solicitors' profession dictates that solicitors and their staff should not be accomplices after the fact of a felony. It demands, on the contrary, that they must report the offences committed and the evidence which prove it. And I did just that. The OSS does not deny the validity of that defence. Yet, its conclusion is:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground " to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission, on its part, that, because of a hidden agenda, solicitors must never maintain the good repute of the profession! But should harbour criminals by not disclosing their offences! It is also an

admission of its judicial and personal bias.

16. ENGAGEMENT IN ACTIVITY THAT DESTROYS HUMAN RIGHT OF OTHERS:

In the light of what is stated above, the recommendation that I be punished for having exercised my freedom of expression, by publishing evidence that prove that serious crimes committed by Lygo, is contrary to the provision of Article 17 of Schedule 1 of Human Right Act 1998. It is a decision that destroys my freedom of expression. The article states:

"Nothing in this Convention may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedom set forth herein".

OSS does not deny the validity of the ground given above. Yet its finding on that ground is:

OSS "does not consider that there was anything in the ground... to persuade them to alter the decision reached"!

In legal terminology, the finding of the OSS is an admission, on its part, that, because of a hidden agenda, the OSS has the right to perform any act aimed at the destruction of the rights or freedom of sick children to recover their money which had been stolen by Lygo! It is also an admission of its judicial and personal bias.

OSS AMONGST THE MOST CORRUPT JUDICIAL BODY

IN THE WORLD

The only conclusion is that the OSS remains one of the most corrupt judicial body in the entire world. Indeed, it has past pretending that it acts as a judicial body! It is anti social. It acts openly on the basis of a hidden agenda! It is a body exclusively engaged in a conspiracy to defeat the end of justice.

CHAPTER 18.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST CORRUPT JUDGES:

LORD CHIEF JUSTICE, LORD BINGHAM

The incident related in this chapter, makes it difficult to see any person mentioning, with honour, the name, Lord Bingham, the Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales!

The incident established two things about Lord Bingham:

- His position as Chief Justice (then Master of the Rolls) is worth much.

- However, his judicial oath, is worth nothing!

Clearly, his departure from the Bench, would be his greatest contribution to the judiciary. It is thus time for him to be addressed, with the greatest respect and humility, in the words of Cromwell, and Leo Amery:

"In the name of God, go".

A SHORT HONEYMOON:

It all started with a letter of complaint, against the Law Society, that I wrote to the Lord Chief Justice, Lord Bingham, in his capacity then, as the Master of the Rolls i.e. the Head of the Court of Appeal with statutory responsibility over the Law Society.

In his reply, Lord Bingham advised me that he could not assist me with the complaint because, in case I decided to appeal, against what I saw as a gross misconduct on the part of some officials of the Law Society, my appeal would be heard by him.

The reply gave me more hope than I had anticipated. And, I said of Bingham, what Lady Thatcher had said of Gorbachov:

He is a man with whom I can do business.

It turned out to be a very short honeymoon.

NO LEGAL JUSTICE:

I prepared my appeal against the racially discriminatory decision of the Law Society which refused to exempt me, whereas it continued to exempt White English Barristers. I lodged it in the High Court. It was the reply to it, from the office of the Master of the Rolls, that brought the honeymoon to an end! The reply was in the form of a direction from the Master of the Rolls, to me and to the Law Society, to attend the hearing of my appeal!

I protested strongly. I asked the Clerk to postpone the hearing till the Law Society had been ordered to prepare its defence to my appeal. And, till a copy of the defence was served upon me. It was contrary to the rule of natural justice, to have the case heard before the defence was lodged! This is because:

- The Law Society knew the grounds of my case.

- I did not know the grounds of their defence!

BETRAYAL OF JUSTICE:

It was the duty of Lord Bingham to ensure that the procedure, for pleadings, was observed. Such a procedure is part of due process. Without due process, there could be no legal justice. Hence, the legal requirement for strict observance, of the rule

of pleading.

My protest was to the point that I was being denied my right to know, in advance, the nature of the defence of the Law Society! It thus appeared to me, that I was being led to a trap. In law, I was, literally, being led to a legal ambush! And the Chief Justice, being a lawyer, could not have been ignorant of that fact! Why then, was he insisting that I attend the hearing in spite of my protest? The threefold consequences of my attending the hearing without a defence being lodged were:

1. The supremacy of the law would have been betrayed. It implied that the case was not to be heard in accordance with the procedure of the law. But, in accordance with the arbitrary decision of Lord Bingham!

2. The parties would not be equal, either before the law, or before the court! The Law Society had been supplied with my pleadings. I had been denied their pleading. In law, the Law Society had been favourably treated. I had been unfavourably treated!

3. There was a conspiracy to defeat justice. Though I was denied the grounds of defence of the Law Society, Lord Bingham was given the defence of the Law Society! Had Lord Bingham not known the defence of the Law Society, he would have insisted that the pleadings be completed! But, knowing it, he felt that it was not necessary to complete the pleading! The question which naturally occurred to me was: How did Lord Bingham come to know about the defence of the Law Society? The only answer was that the Law Society told him

about it. He asked for it behind my back. And it was given to him behind my back! In so doing, Lord Bingham, conspired, in law, to defeat the end of justice. I was to learn much later, that, on learning what the defence of the Law Society was, the Chief Justice made two vital decisions behind my back! These were:

- That he did not have the jurisdiction to hear the case!

- That, in the circumstances, the Law Society need not send me its defence!

In that way, the Chief Justice betrayed the law! And he double-crossed me!

HEAP OF JUDICIAL INJUSTICE:

It was when my Counsel, Mr. Emmanuel Oteng and I, reached the court, for the hearing of my appeal, that Counsel for the Law Society handed to my Counsel, the defence of the Law Society! It was then, that Counsel realised that the sole defence of the Law Society was that Lord Bingham, in his capacity, as the Master of the Rolls, had no jurisdiction to determine my appeal. While my Counsel was still reading the defence, which constituted the legal ambush, Lord Bingham came into the court!

Lord Bingham addressed the court saying that, as it turned out, the issue before the court was whether the Master of the

Rolls had, or had no jurisdiction to hear my appeal. He did not ask either my Counsel or Counsel for the Law Society to say a word at that stage! Instead, Lord Bingham addressed me directly.

He apologised to me for the content of the letter that he wrote to me. The letter, as explained above, stated that he could not intervene in my dispute with the Law Society, because an appeal on the dispute lay to him. In the court, Lord Bingham regretted that his letter might have misled me to make the appeal to him. However, he had since learnt that as a matter of fact, he did not have the jurisdiction to hear an appeal in the matter!

While he was addressing me, I kept saying within myself:

- The Law Society has just given my Counsel its defence of lack of jurisdiction.

- Lord Bingham has just told us his decision based on that defence of lack of jurisdiction!

- He is taking for granted that I do not have say on the issue of lack of jurisdiction! I was thus summoned here merely as a spectator!

Then Lord Bingham proceeded forthwith, to reveal to me a further secret assurance that he had received from the Law Society! He stated that the Law Society had confided in him. First, it had told him about the decision of the Industrial Tribunal, that the guidelines of the Law Society, for exempting English barristers was indirectly racially

discriminatory against me. Secondly, it had told him that, as a result of that decision, the Law Society had decided **not** to enforce the law, that empowered it to exempt English Barristers! Third that as a result of that decision no English Barrister was going to be exempted. In the circumstances, said Lord Bingham, since I am an English Barrister and wanted to become a solicitor, was I prepared to sit for the test to become a solicitor?

As any lawyer would know, I just could not believe my ears! Here was the Master of the Rolls, whose function was, amongst others, to see to it that the Law Society enforced, the laws of the country. And that same Master of the Rolls was seated in a court of law, telling me, in effect, that the Law Society had decided to defy the law! And, by implication, that he himself had approved of that defiance! Lord Bingham knows that:

According to the plainest principles of law and of common sense, no man can forfeit any right except that which he has. The Law Society could not suspend enforcement of my legal entitlement that it was their duty to enforce. Only the legislators, who made that law, could suspend its enforcement.

To add insult to injury, Lord Bingham was asking whether I too, would voluntarily, co-operate in the defiance of the law of the land!

With a polite and generous dissimulation Lord Bingham affected not to know the object for the alleged refusal to

implement the law. But, it was clear that he was not the dupe of the Law Society. Nor did it require an observant eye to fail detect that he had an axe to grind. He harboured an improper motive disguised under spacious pretences of justice. He knew 6 things about the so-called suspension of the implementation of the law:

1. It was a defiance of the Law of the nation.

2. The Law Society had no locus standi to defy the law of the nation.

3. Its sole object was to prevent me from being exempted in accordance with the order of the Industrial Tribunal that I had been discriminated against on racial ground.

4. The decision to suspend the law thus openly constituted contempt of the order of the Court!

5. Further since the purpose for the defiance of the law was to victimise me, the defiance was contrary to the Race Relations Act 1976!

6. Lord Bingham also knew that alleged suspension of the Law was a ruse for public consumption. Exemption of White Barristers continued secretly! As the Master of the Rolls, responsible for admission of English Barristers as solicitors, he could not have failed to know what was going on!

THE MOLE:

Knowing what he knew, it was insensitive of Lord Bingham to ask me whether I would be a party to my racial discrimination! And that was exactly my answer. I said:

Sir, I will not be a party to my own racial discrimination!

With that answer, the hearing duly ended with embarrassment all around!

My answer made it clear that Lord Bingham had become a party to a conspiracy to defeat justice. He was like a mole, which grubbed underground. Indeed, behind the heap of judicial injustice flung up, as shown above, was Lord Bingham.

I had always been of the opinion that the Great Master of the Rolls would not be so unmindful of his own duty! He was head of the Court of Appeal! And, he was the trustee of the common interest of justice! In either capacity, it was inconceivable that he could simply abandon a case which disclosed so openly, official racial discrimination, official contempt of court, and official treachery to our laws!

Unhappily, instead of raising a great question of public interest, of which it was his duty, as a judge, to raise, he chose to raise a personal question, which was his duty, as a judge never to raise!

The question which it was his duty as a judge to raise, was:

Has the Law Society, a public body, whose duty was to administer the law, the locus standi to refuse to administer the law? Can it defy the law by refusing to administer it?

The personal question he raised, which it was not his duty to raise: was whether I would agree to be less favourably treated than the White English Barristers who were exempted without proof of knowledge required by law!

It was incredible that Lord Bingham, as a man of sense, to whom the details of my case had been given, should not have asked a very simple question:

Is it fair that this man, a barrister of over 30 years standing, should be made to sit for a test when all his White colleagues, even those with hardly 8 years of legal practice, have not been made to sit for any test?

He failed to ask that question because power had entered his head! It turned it, in such a way that, he saw his vices as a sort of public spirit! He saw his vanity, his concessions on points of principle, his betrayal of justice, as the need, inherent in his post, to side with the "upper-dogs", instead of with the under-dogs!

He thus forgot his duty to justice and to his reputation. His head, strong for academic purposes, was weak against the intoxicating influence of prejudices. He became bias to the extent that a reasonable man watching the proceeding would have said:

This Judge is bias!

When I left the court, I carried out necessary legal researches, which I would have carried out, had the defence been served upon me. Once more it turned out that the legal ambush had succeeded in its task to defeat justice! I found out that although the Master of the Rolls had no jurisdiction to investigate the complaint, when presented in the form of an appeal, he had jurisdiction to investigate it, when presented as an application for admission! Under the provision of s. 3(2) of the Solicitors Act 1974 the applications for admission as a solicitor, are made to the Master of the Rolls! Hence, the Master of the Rolls could, at least, have enquired why I had not been admitted to practise law as a solicitor, whereas my colleagues, who applied after me continued to be admitted as solicitors!

BINGHAM AND DENNING:

It was quite clear that there is an infinity between Lord Bingham and Lord Denning. Lord Denning was born great. Further, he achievement greatness. Lord Bingham was not born great. Nor has he achieved greatness. He has had greatness thrust upon him.

Purely from the point of view of law, Bingham behaved, literally, like a madman, without any sense or the knowledge of law. I realised the unspeakable wrongs of a judge, talking like a parrot, saying things whose implications against his

integrity, is hateful!

The world is sometimes misled to ascribe virtue to the undeserving. The appointment of Justice Jeffrey to the post of the Chief Justice, which ought to have been held by a virtuous man, was such a classical case. The appointment of Lord Bingham to the same post is yet, another such a classical case.

LEGAL INCOMPETENCY:

In the circumstances, any praise of Lord Bingham appears based on little knowledge of him. It follows that his praise will always continue to dwindle, by close researches. Throughout my case, he showed himself to be morally insensitive and legally incompetent.

A friend of mine said of him:

"Well, I never thought that I would ever feel that a person, who is the Chief Justice for England and Wales, can aptly be described as dregs of a lawyer! Yet, the only description that seems to fit the Heart of Stone that he has showed, is that he is: Dregs of a lawyer".

There is no question that the Chief Justice has been to justice like thorns. Just as figs from thorns are not gathered, so have we learnt not to expect justice from him. From such a thorn of a judge, none ought expect to gather figs of justice.

The time he spent hatching a conspiracy, to pervert the course of justice, for the purpose of punishing one man should, bear its due fruit. It calls for an investigation to expose the power behind the conspiracy to defeat justice.

COVERING UP OFFENCES:

Whenever a truthful theory appears, it explains all the factual evidence. The only theory that explains all the factual evidence in this case is that, the Law Society deliberately abused the power of its office in the hope that it would get away with it. In a desperate attempt to get away with it, it induced corrupt judges to cover up its offences.

To conclude, had Lord Bingham been any ordinary professional lawyer, he would probably have had less capacity to wreak havoc, than the dustman, in No. 10 Downing Street. We probably would never have heard of him. But when he was invested with the power of the Master of the Rolls, and subsequently appointed the Chief Justice of England, he found himself possessing power to do boundless mischief. And, he did boundless mischief.

The judiciary under him has become one combustible matter, waiting for a spark. I pray, that this book serves as the long awaited spark, in the form of public investigations of the corrupt judges in our judiciary.

CHAPTER 19.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST JUST PRACTISING LAWYER:

COUNSEL RICHARD CLAYTON:

Very seldom has any charges devised by impostors, been so impartially prosecuted, by a man of parts and integrity. The false charges brought against me, was prosecuted by counsel of irreproachable reputation. He is Barrister Richard Clayton. At all times, he acted with frankness and good faith consistent with his duty as a barrister.

He was in a position to take an unfair advantage of me. And, he was in a position to get away with it. As, indeed, many have. But, as soon as the case opened, it became clear, that he would not take that advantage of the bias against me by the Anonymous Judges of the Bar and the Gang of Four of the Law Society.

THE ISSUE OF THE PANEL OF 5.

After waiting in vain for one member of the panel of judges, His Honour Judge Gelega King, to arrive, the Chairman, His Honour Judge Mitchel, addressed me thus:

THE CHAIRMAN: The step we are asking you about now, is, are you content for this Tribunal to hear anything, any preliminary application, any aspect of this particular case, without Mr. King, who of course, was named on the convening order? Do you consent to that?

DR. ADOKO: No. I do not consent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Over to you, Mr. Clayton. What is your view about this, Mr. Gelega King being absent.

MR. CLAYTON: Judge, I have had the opportunity of considering it briefly. I am afraid I take the view that it is a formidable difficulty. Can I explain why?

THE CHAIRMAN: Please do.

MR. CLAYTON: " Sub-rule (1) imposes a mandatory requirement of five persons constituting the tribunal. " I would suggest that the best course would be for this hearing to proceed in front of five. If that could be done expeditiously I am sure that would serve all parties".

THE CHAIRMAN: (Consults Members of the Panel):Just because it is a snap judgement does not mean it is not absolutely right and I agree with you".

The panel thus bowed to the opinion of Counsel Clayton. The

hearing of the case was adjourned. The appointing authority was contacted. Another member of the panel, Mr. Richard Gray, was appointed to replace Judge King The hearing then resumed.

THE ISSUE OF 2 CHARGES:

As soon as the hearing resumed, Counsel Richard Clayton, on his own initiative, moved that one of the charges against me be dismissed! The sole object of duplication of the charges was to create the impression that I had committed more than one misconduct! Clayton pointed out that the second charge was an unnecessary duplication! The hearing started thus:

CHAIRMAN: As you know, there has been developments and I think we are now properly constituted.

MR. HORSFORD: I would normally start by putting the charges.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am treating this as the beginning of the proceedings. Doctor.

DR. ADOKO: Yes.

MR. HORSFORD: Dr. Adoko, would you rise please?

DR. ADOKO: Yes.

MR. HORSFORD: I will put two charges to you. They are

professional misconduct contrary to paragraphs 802.1(a) "

MR. CLAYTON: Sir, it occurs to me that there is an element of duplication in the two charges. I wonder if we should proceed in the first charge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whichever you choose. If you think that is right. It is a matter entirely for you! "

CLAYTON: They appear to be identical, save that the first one is longer, than the second. I have asked the person who drafted this as to the distinction and I do not think there is one. I thought we could dismiss 2. "

HORSFORD: It is just one charge Dr. Adoko.

DR. ADOKO: Yes.

Mr. Horsford then read only the first charge.

So, with one word from Mr. Clayton, one charge against me was dismissed! Had he been a vindictive Counsel, one word from him would have added a third charge!.

Such is the breath of power!

THE SUMMING UP:

The summing up by Clayton was very significant. To quote from the transcript of the proceedings, it is word by word as

follows:

"I will be very brief indeed making effectively two points. Firstly, our contention is that what has been argued does not amount to defences at all. It might conceivably go to mitigation. Secondly, to point out that there appears to be a lacunae at this stage. Although the argument appears to be that section 4 justifies what happened, what criminal offences allege to have been committed remain a complete mystery and it perhaps worth emphasising that the Industrial Tribunal Proceedings had concluded; that Dr. Adoko had succeeded in getting a declaration some months prior to the press conference; that no purpose was served in terms of the race discrimination proceedings by the press conference because the whole case had been concluded. I felt that I ought at least to make that point in my final remarks and that is all I propose to say"!

Counsel made only 2 points. First, he dealt with only one point of law that I raised! He did not deal with all the other defences that I raised. The reason for his failure to do so, was obvious. Second, the only point of law he dealt with, is section 4 which imposed a duty upon me, to report a crime! And his only comment on that point was that, the crimes were a mystery! But, were they?

I had included, in the Bundle of Documents, the proper indictment of Lord Lester and his Gang of Four. The indictment contains specific 72 charges and specific particulars of offence for each charge! They included:

- Doing an act tending and intended to pervert the course of public justice.

- Perverting the course of justice.

- Obtaining pecuniary advantage by deception.

- Fraud.

The Chairman prevented me from reading them on the ground that the panel had already read them! Mr. Justice Wright prevented me from calling witnesses to prove the offences. His Honour Judge Altman had ruled that the law required them to be proved. In short, the submission of Counsel was proof of the conspiracy by the court, not by the Counsel, to defeat the end of justice! Had Justice Wright allowed me to call witnesses to prove the offences, had Judge Mitchell allowed me to read the details of the offences, Counsel would not have made the point!

The following quotation from the transcript shows how Mitchel went all the way out to prevent me from disclosing in court the crimes committed by Lord Lester and his Gang:

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it right that you wish to a take preliminary point?

DR. ADOKO: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I assist you in this way?

DR. ADOKO: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have read and I know that my colleagues have read a number of documents which have been received which seem to set out certain complaints about the Tribunal dealing with you, if I can put it in general terms.

DR. ADOKO: That is right, Sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: What I would invite you to do, bearing in mind that we have read these documents and have an idea of your complaint about the way things are proceedings, that you add anything to those particular documents, which of course, we have read, that you would like to put before us now. Do that now if you so choose, if there are anything you want to add. There may be nothing additional. I do not know.

DR. ADOKO: Sir, first of all, there is a new member amongst the judges, who has not read these documents.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you have read quite a few of these. Have you not?

MR. GRAY: I have certainly read these. Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is why we have started at 2 O'clock, Doctor.

DR. ADOKO: But it is a big document!

THE CHAIRMAN: It is indeed.

DR. ADOKO: A lot of incidences. I think perhaps the best thing for me to do is to go very, very briefly through the chronology of events.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not discouraging you from doing that and bearing in mind that we have all of us now, including the member of the panel that was substituted, read these documents. What I am really inviting you to do is to by all means summarise them.

DR. ADOKO: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We do not need to hear it all again. We know the strengths and weaknesses there may be, but perhaps you could deal with any additional matters that you want to bring to our attention as to why we should not proceed to hear the charge.

It went on like that for quite sometime. I insisted on stating my case, albeit briefly. I did not believe that all the members of the panel had read all the papers in the big bundle of documents, that I had submitted. The Chairman ruled, again and again, that I should not state what I had already pleaded! He claims that all the members of the panel had read it! When I asked him, how did he know? He asked me to take his word for it!

Yet, at the summing up, Counsel for the Bar confessed that my accusations of Lord Lester and the Gang were a mystery! In short, he had not read it. From the questions subsequently asked, it was equally clear that some members of the Panel,

like De Lord Desai, had not read it!

PENALTY:

During the adjournment for the panel of judges to reach their finding, Counsel Clayton assured me that as far as the Bar was concerned, there was none against me. It was unfortunate the dispute had arisen. But that, judging from the nature of the complaint and the defences to it, he expected the punishment to be light.

Clearly he was, just as I was, surprised by the heavy penalty of 12 months suspension.

SEARCH FOR AMICABLE SETTLEMENT:

I knew Counsel Richard Clayton to be a just man. And in that capacity I telephoned him up and asked for his advice. I assured him that I did not want to quarrel with the Bar, the Law Society, and the Inns of Court. But, somehow, a quarrel erupted between the Law Society and me. It seems to have gained its own momentum. It was spinning out of control. I was anxious to have it contained. I informed him that, to that end, I was prepared to withdraw the cases I had brought against the Bar, the Inns of Court and the Law Society. The condition for withdrawal was that, in their turn, they would

undertake not to enforce any orders of cost they have against me. Further, they should accept that they would allow me to practice law without any further hindrance. He undertook to pass my offer to the Bar and through the Bar to the other bodies.

Hardly a day past when I received the letter from the Bar accepting the offer. I also withdrew the case of racial discrimination that I had brought against the Bar. Further, I withdrew the civil case that I had brought against its Anonymous Judges. On its part the Bar waived the costs of £400 that the Disciplinary Tribunal of Judge Mitchel had ordered me to pay to them. The Bar was generous enough, to go out of its way, to assure me that I was free to resume my legal practice as a barrister, on completion of the punishment imposed by the Disciplinary Tribunal.

The Inns of Court also accepted my offer. And I withdrew all cases against them. I also withdrew the case against Mr. Justice Wright who was being defended by the Inns of Court.

As was to be expected, with the undue influence of Solicitor Robin Lewis, the Law Society refused the offer! Thereafter, because of the conduct of the Law Society, the dispute continued to spin out of control.

DUTY AS PROSECUTING COUNSEL:

I have acted as a prosecuting counsel. I have also seen several

prosecuting counsels at work. Of all the prosecuting counsels I have had the privilege of watching in court, Counsel Richard Clayton, came closest to fulfilling the legal requirement, that prosecuting counsels should:

In addition to ensuring that every material point is made which supports the prosecution, also ensure, that the evidence is presented dispassionately and with scrupulous fairness.

CHAPTER 20.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST JUST JUDGES:

MR JUSTICE BROOKE:

A friend of mine insisted that, just as a woman needs the assistance of another woman, to deliver a baby, so does a man need the assistance of another man, to relieve the pain of worries. He recommended that I explain to Mr. Justice Brooke, the nature of my complaint of racial discrimination, by the Law Society. He spoke very highly about Mr. Justice Brooke. Said he:

"Whenever the issue of injustice is raised, Mr. Justice

Brooke forgets that he is a judge of the Supreme Court! His aloofness comes to an end. His concern for justice takes over. There is not a child, not a woman, not a man whose sorrow does not melt his heart. He is that kind of a man!"

And so I wrote an appeal to Mr. Justice Brooke. I asked him to intervene in my complaint of racial discrimination, by the Law Society.

Shortly afterwards, I received his reply. He wrote a covering letter to the Chairman of the Race Relations Committee of the Law Society. He enclosed, in it, a copy of the letter of my complaint. And he requested the Chairman of the Race Relations Committee, to see whether the Committee could investigate my complaint.

On receipt of his letter, my heart did swell with much pride! A whole Judge of the Supreme Court, had recommended that my complaint be investigated. In the circumstances, I did not see how the Law Society could fail to investigate the complaint. I recalled the saying:

What dost thou fear! Thou hast a Caesar on board!

As it turned out, I was mistaken. All the expostulations by Mr. Justice Brooke, fell on deaf ears! The Law Society had apparently set its heart on denying me justice. It was not prepared to carry out necessary investigations! The Race Relations Committee refused to answer any of my letters! It was as if Mr. Justice Brooke had never written to them any

letter!

Such was the height of racism within the Law Society!

Looking at the whole sad history now, with the advantage of a rear view, the Law Society may now appreciate, rather belatedly, the wisdom of the request, made by Mr. Justice Brooke.

A stitch on time, indeed, saves nine. Had the Law Society investigated the complaint as requested, and as it was their duty to do, public money, running into hundreds of thousands of pounds, would not have been pocketed, by the like of Lord Lester and Robin Lewis! Nor would thousands of hours of a public office, have been wasted in a complaint of racial discrimination! After all, a court of law later found that the Law Society had racially discriminated against me!

It follows that the Law Society, and the Law Society alone, is to blame for this unfortunate saga.

The request of Mr. Justice Brooke was based on the fact that people are quite disposed to accept determinations of public bodies, provided the determinations are reasonable. Mr. Justice Brooke was sure, just as I am sure, that had the Race Relations Committee investigated the complaint, and delivered a reasonable judgement I would have accepted that judgement. And the dispute would have come to an end.

I was not asking much from the Race Relations Committee. Only 2 things:

1. Please investigate the issues in dispute between the parties

2. And to enable us know why you have determined each issue in one way or the other, please, give sufficient reason for the determination.

In short, the request was merely that they should carry out their legal duty. And their silence was, as is the practice of the Law Society, a defiance of the law!

CHAPTER 21.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST JUST JUDGES:

HIS HONOUR JUDGE ALTMAN:

It is human for man to identify himself with an impartial judgement. It does not matter whether the judgement is in our favour or not. It is in its fairness, that we feel most at home. And it is that fairness that lifts, from our minds, the load of bitterness that is invariably associated with legal disputes.

I had brought a case of racial discrimination against the Law Society for undue delay to determine my application for

exemption. It was heard and determined by His Honour Judge Altman, acting as Chairman of the Industrial Tribunal

I lost the case. Judge Altman blamed the Law Society for the undue delay. But he ruled that it did not constitute racial discrimination.

Yet, what a relief I felt! I found myself saying:

The judgement is fair. The dispute is settled.

Judge Altman did 3 other things.

1. He insisted that the Law Society must set a date for considering my application for exemption.

2. He condemned, in the strongest terms, the conduct of the Law Society towards me.

3. He refused to award costs against me for having pleaded that Lord Lester, Solicitor Robin Lewis and the Gang of Four, had committed criminal offences. He ruled that such accusations should be determined on their merit, after the evidence for and against them is heard!

DATE FOR CONSIDERING MY APPLICATION.

First, Judge Altman insisted that he would not leave the court unless and until the date for determining my application was given to him in writing. The Law Society gave one excuse

after another for not setting the date! The person responsible for doing so, they said, could not be traced. The judge insisted that he be traced. Then the Law Society said that the person was on holidays. Then the judge insisted that in that case the acting official should set the date. Ultimately the judge received a fax, setting a date in October 1995, for determining my application.

For historical accuracy, it is necessary to point out here that the application was not determined in October 1995! On the contrary, in October 1995, it was adjourned to November 1995! And in November 1995, it was again adjourned to December 1995. I was ultimately exempted in December 1995! It took the Law Society 5 years to exempt me! It generally takes hardly 3 months to exempt White English Barristers!

THE JUDGE CONDEMNS THE LAW SOCIETY !

The second thing the judge did, was to express publicly his serious concern about the conduct of the officials of the Law Society! In his judgement he noted that it took the officials of the Law Society 3 months to answer my letter, whereas the letters of other applicants were invariably answered in a day or two after receipt!

The Judge further noted that although 3 weeks had elapsed from the date on which my application for exemption, was scheduled to be considered, yet, I had not been informed of

what had happened!

He then proceeded to condemn the conduct of the Law Society, in the strongest terms! He was obliged to use the word "shame" three times to describe the conduct of the Law Society! This is what he said:

"On 8 March the Respondent replied and said that they would consider the matter and they did so after a passage of time on 5 June 1995 in some detail in a letter which set out their position. They re-iterated their willingness to consider the application and that their view remain the same, that they had taken Counsel's opinion which no doubt explain the passage of time, and urged the Applicant to consider making an application for exemption. He did that by a letter sent virtually by return of post. Originally that was going to be dealt with on 12 July but we have been told that the committee that was to consider it had too much business to reach that item on the agenda. Yesterday, we were told that the Law Society intended to consider it in October, but they could not promise. I am glad that as a result of degree of prompting by myself today the Law Society has now undertaken to deal with that matter in October. It is only a side issue but it is always a **shame** in a modern and efficient administration that has such widespread responsibilities such as the Law Society, that the consequences of decisions of importance being made by committees that only meet periodically is often that, first, sometimes all matters set for a particular date are not dealt with, and, secondly, that the next date when they are considered is put off for so long. I don't know the circumstances in this case, but one sees it time and time again,

and it is a great **shame** that committees don't sit late to complete agenda rather than just waiting to the next meeting. One knows the anguish that these applications cause when someone is waiting day-by-day for a letter to come and it doesn't. It was a **shame** that by yesterday something over 3 months after the 12 July the Applicant had not heard anything"!

After that judgement, I was made to wait for 16 months (i.e. from July 1998 to September 1999) for a letter informing me about 3 more obstacles which were to be raised against my admission as a solicitor. The technical obstacles are:

1. That I had published confidential documents which disclosed the criminal offences of Lord Lester and the Gang of Four! The Law Society had referred that complaint to the Bar. As a result of that reference, I was denied legal practise as a solicitor from 1995 to 1999 i.e. 4 years! In spite of that very severe punishment, the case against me on the same matter is to be started afresh before the Law Society! Such is the effect of the plot to defeat justice that characterise my case! According the Law Society, the White lawyers accused of the same type of misconduct, have not been refused legal practise even for one day!

2. That I had published over the internet, the criminal offences committed by Michael Lygo, the Chief Accountant of the Great Ormond Street Hospital. The detail of this case is given in Chapter 19. It is not claimed that I owe Lygo a duty of confidentiality. Nor is it denied that the law imposed upon me a duty to disclose thefts of public money. Nor is it denied that

I have a right to publish what took place in an open court or that only the High Court had jurisdiction to determine any complaint concerning what is so published. Etc. etc.

3. The third point arose from the dismissal of my libel case by 3 judges of the Court of Appeal! The sole ground given by the 3 appeal judges was that, my counsel, had been guilty of professional negligence in not amending the Notice of Appeal! The ground was purely technical! It bears no moral stigma whatsoever! As a result of that decision costs amounting to several thousands of pounds was awarded against me. Had the Law Society allowed me to practise law during for the 10 years, I would have paid it. But because the Law Society denied me legal practise, I had no alternative but to declare myself bankrupt! In law that means that I can work as a solicitor. But it does not allow me to head a firm of solicitor. And all that I am asking for is to work as a solicitor.

PROOF OF THE CRIMES OF LESTER

The most important finding by His Honour Judge Altman, was, however, with regard to my accusation of Lord Lester, Solicitor Robin Lewis, and the Gang of Four of various offences, including a conspiracy to defeat the end of justice. Counsel for the Law Society had insisted that because I had pleaded those offences, I should be made to pay the cost of the case. The judge refused! As far as the judge was concerned, whether the accused persons were innocent or not,

whether my accusations were true or not, could only be determined by evidence!

You would think that what Judge Altman had said was common place! In the case of the Law Society, for a judge to say that much, amounted to:

A Daniel come to judgement.

I was impressed by the depth of the commitment of Judge Altman to the cause of truth and justice.

I was impressed by his manifest independence and impartiality.

PETTY APARTHEID:

He knew that the law does not concern itself with trifles, such as, for instance, delays by a month or two, to consider my application for exemption. But, he also knew that when such failures is the result of petty apartheid, to which the Law Society seemed to have stooped, then, its consequences was in no way petty to its victims. He thus held that in such cases, the law should concern itself with such petty apartheid. He was accordingly the first, and the last judge, to give, in explicit terms, the strongest warning to the Law Society against such petty apartheid.

His judgement makes it clear that public display of

preferences which appear to be of a racial nature, is not merely offensive, but an effective way to spread discriminatory practices.

His quick perception and dauntless courage made him a formidable power, for justice.

CHAPTER 22.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST JUST JUDGES:

HIS HONOUR JUDGE PROSSER:

OUTRAGEOUS CONDUCT:

As seen from the chronology for racial discrimination, each and every decision, made by the Law Society in my application, had been so malicious, so unreasonable, and so outrageous in their defiance of logic, that no officials, acting in good faith, could have made them!

MISUSE OF POWER:

The law is that, a public body must not misuse its power. It is a misuse of power for a public body, such as the Law Society, to act unfairly towards any person, where there is no overriding public interest to warrant it.

LEGAL REMEDY:

The law does not merely prohibit unfair action by public servants. It also punishes it. Whenever the decisions of public officials have violated the right of others, the law provides that the public body that has caused that damage, must pay compensation for it. The Common Law principal is that:

ibi jus ubi remedium i.e. where there is a right, there is also a corresponding remedy.

In the case of Ashby v. White (see: 92 ER 126 (1703) at 136) Lord Chief Justice Holt explained the law thus:

"Indeed, it is a vain thing to imagine a right without a remedy, for want of right and want of remedy are reciprocal".

3 CAUSES OF ACTION:

As the decision of the Law Society had broken every law in the book, and it was both tedious and unnecessary to bring a

hundred and one cases against the Law Society, I found myself obliged to choose and pick, the causes of action on which to base my case. I chose three. They are:

1. Breach of statutory duty.

2. Gross Professional negligence.

3. Abuse of power of a public office.

I lodged my case for damages, in the Royal Court of Justice, Queen's Bench Division, case number 1996 A 1790.

BREACHES OF A STATUTORY DUTY:

My first claim was for a breach of a statutory duty, imposed on the Law Society for the benefit of a limited class of people, namely the English Barristers who were seeking to become solicitors. I was an English Barrister. And the Law Society owed me that duty. Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers Transfer Regulation 1990, provided that the sole criterion for exemption of English Barristers, from the requirement to do a test in Professional Conduct, and Solicitors' Accounts, was proof of knowledge in the said 2 subjects. Yet, contrary to the requirement of that law, although I provided more proof of knowledge in the 2 subjects, yet, I was refused exemption. My colleagues who provided proof of ignorance in the two subjects, were exempted! The Law Society had itself admitted its breach of a statutory duty towards me. By virtue of that

admission, I was entitled to be given judgement, in my favour, without the need for any further hearing.

The Law Society had committed in all, 13 individual incidences of abuse of power of a public office! These are enumerated below.

As a result of the 13 breaches of the law, I suffered damage of the kind that the statute is intended to prevent, namely I was refused exemption on ground that I had not practised law in England for 8 years! I accordingly suffered special damage peculiar to myself.

The followings are the 4 special damages that I suffered:

1. I was forced to seek employment with junior lawyers who should have been employed by me!

2. I was, obliged, at first, to accept as my remuneration only 1/3 of the proceed of my legal work! This was later increased to 2/5.

3. I was denied the opportunity to employ junior lawyers from whom I too, would have received 2/3 of the income of their legal work. Indeed, at my recommendation, three of the lawyers whom I wanted to employ, were employed by other solicitors. Those firms of solicitors were taking two-third of their earned income! Three others lawyers, were, at the time, waiting for me to open my firm of solicitors so that they could join me.

4. I was forced to waste most of my time in fighting the

malicious decisions of the Law Society! I was obliged to prepare pamphlets, and to bring cases in the High Court, Industrial Tribunal, Employment Appeal Tribunal, Court of Appeal. I was also obliged to defend myself before the Bar Council and before the Offices for the Supervision of Solicitors for having mercilessly exposed the offences committed by the staff and friends of the Law Society.

NEGLIGENCE OF DUTY:

My second cause of action against the Law Society was for gross professional negligence. The Law Society holds itself as having special skill in legal matters! Consequently, I expected it to show some competence in the interpretation and enforcement of legal duties. Yet, as shown above, its interpretation of the provision of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers Transfer Regulation 1990, and its enforcement of the said provision of the law, were such that no prudent and reasonable man, and, definitely, no prudent and reasonable professional person or body would have done so!

There were, in all, 13 individual incidences of negligence on the part of the Law Society! These are given below.

The followings are the 3 particulars of the acts, not of the incidences. of negligence, committed by the Law Society:

1. It interpreted and enforced the very simple legal requirement, of proof of knowledge of professional conduct

and account, which even a lay person cannot mistake, as the requirement for proving the locality of legal practice!

2. Although as a barrister, I carried out my duty to them, as solicitors, by advising them on the points of law of legal requirements for exemption, yet, out of malice, they simply turned a deaf ears and blind eyes to my legal advice!

3. It took the Law Society an excessively long time, about 5 years, to correct the mistake which any prudent and reasonable professional body or even any lay employer, would have corrected within one week!

TORT OF MISFEASANCE

My third cause of action was the well-established tort of misfeasance by public officers in the discharge of their public duties.

The followings are the 8 particulars of abuse of power by the Law Society:

1. Proportionality or reasonableness: Contrary to the provisions of the European Legal Principle of proportionality, the Law Society abused the power of a public office, by imposing the obligation of the locality of legal practice, beyond those which were appropriate and necessary to achieve the objective of the law. The imposition of the alien criterion, violated the English law requirement that public

officials should act fairly, and reasonably.

2. Legal Certainty or Legitimate expectation: Contrary to the European Principle of Legal Certainty, the unlawful guidelines, imposed by the Law Society, for the exemption of English Barristers, violated my legitimate expectation, that the Law Society would abide by the law. The courts, in England and Wales, always protect the legitimate expectation of persons served by public servants. The Law Society breached my legitimate expectation that I, a senior English Barrister, with over 25 years of legal practice at the time, would be exempted in the same way as my colleagues, the senior English Barristers who were given automatic exemptions, on the ground of 8 years of legal practice!

3. Fundamental Rights: Article 17 of the European Convention of Human Rights prevents public servants from engagement in activities, which destroy fundamental rights of others. The treatment that the Law Society meted to me effectively destroyed my fundamental rights.

4. Conflict of Interest Rule: In spite of the conflict of interest rule, the Law Society appointed Mrs. Anne Coles, to act in a judicial position to deny me exemption! Mrs. Coles was, at the time acting as the solicitors for the Law Society, in a case that I had brought against the Law Society! Yet, the Law Society made her act as the Secretary, to the quasi-judicial committee that was considering my application for exemption!

5. Abuse of Power of Office: Thereafter Mrs. Coles

maliciously abused the power of her quasi-judicial office to double cross me! She collected, in her judicial capacity, confidential information that I had submitted to her, and used it to make applications against me to the Industrial Tribunal!

6. Equality or Uniformity: The Law Society also violated the European Law Principle of Equality, or the English court principle of uniformity. That principle requires persons in similar situations to be treated in the same way. Mrs. Coles promptly devised a confrontational discriminatory test to be used to determine my application for exemption! None of the other English Barristers were to be subjected to that test!

7. Rule of Natural Justice: Again, contrary to the rule of natural justice, which requires public servants to act fairly, the Law Society, in the person of Mrs. Coles erased material information which I had submitted for my exemption, so that the Law Society judges, who were to determine my application, should not see it!

8. Fraudulent Concealment: In her capacity as Secretary to a quasi judicial body, Mrs. Coles, fraudulently concealed from me, and from the quasi judicial judges who were to determine my application for exemption, a material practice. It was the practice that an English Barrister, who had practised law for 2 years in the office of English Solicitors, was entitled to an automatic exemption! The result was that I alone, is the only English Barrister, who was refused exemption, after practising law in the offices of English Solicitors, for more than 2 years!

39 ACTIONS AGAINST THE LAW SOCIETY.

Each of the 3 causes of action on which my case was based, i.e., breaches of the law, negligence, and abuse of power, was itself based on 13 incidences. In short, I had brought 39 actions against the Law Society. The 13 incidences on which the case was based are as follows:

1. On 17/12/1989 I applied, in my capacity as an English Barrister to be allowed to practise law as a solicitor. The Law Society informed me that I did not qualify for automatic admission under the Overseas Solicitors Admission Order. Contrary to its duty, it failed to inform me that I was entitled, as an English Barrister, to apply for exemption from the requirement to do the test in the 2 subjects. Yet, it informed all the other Senior English Barristers about their right to apply for exemption! The failure of the Law Society to inform me of my right was:

- A breach of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers

- Transfer Regulations 1990.

- Negligence of duty.

- An abuse of power of office.

2. On 08/01/1991 I applied for admission as a solicitor and again, the Law Society did not inform me, although it informed other Senior English Barrister, of the entitlement, as Senior English Barristers, to apply for exemption. Again the

failure of the Law Society to inform me of my entitlement was:

- A breach of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers

- Transfer Regulations 1990.

- Negligence of duty.

- An abuse of power of office.

3. On 01/05/1991 the Law Society turned down the recommendation by its own secretariat, that I be exempted, in my capacity as a Senior English Barrister, in the same way that it had exempted other Senior English Barristers, from the need to do the Test in the 2 subjects! That decision was again:

- A breach of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers

- Transfer Regulations 1990.

- Negligence of duty.

- An abuse of power of office.

4. On 27/01/1993 although the Law Society continued to exempt Senior English Barristers, including those of them who confessed their absolute ignorance in the 2 subjects, it refused to exempt me! Yet, I had produced to it, by far, the most impressive proof of knowledge:

i. My 25 years of legal practice.

ii. My legal practice based on the same rules.

iii. I attended a course in the 2 subjects.

iv. I obtained over 40% marks in the 2 subjects.

v. I worked in the offices of English solicitors for over a year.

In the circumstances, the refusal to exempt me was:

- A breach of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers

- Transfer Regulations 1990.

- Negligence of duty.

- An abuse of power of office.

5. On 09/04/1993 the Law Society considered my appeal against its refusal to exempt me, while it continued to exempt the White Senior English Barristers who had produced no proof of knowledge in the 2 subjects. The Law Societ dismissed my appeal! The dismissal of my appeal was:

- A breach of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers

- Transfer Regulations 1990.

- Negligence of duty.

- An abuse of power of office.

6. On 14/07/1993 the Law Society refused to reconsider my application for exemption. The reason it gave for doing so

was that I had applied for a judicial review of its decision!

In law, the withdrawal of that decision, was an admission by the Law Society that:

- A breach of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers

- Transfer Regulations 1990.

- Negligence of duty.

- An abuse of power of office.

7. On 29/09/93 the Law Society again reconsidered my application for exemption. This time the Law Society itself had asked the senior partners of the 2 firms of solicitors, in which I had worked to submit testimonials about the legal practice . There was no request for the testimonial to deal with any specific subjects. Consequently the testimonial did not deal with any specific subjects. Both the testimonials recommended that I was conversant with the laws governing the legal practice of English Solicitors and that I was a competent legal practitioner. Both stated that my legal work was superior to that of an average English Solicitor. Both the recommendations were simply ignored as constituting no new evidence! It was the first time that the recommendation of supervising solicitors, recommending an applicant for exemption, was simply ignored! In the circumstances there was:

- A breach of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers

- Transfer Regulations 1990.

- Negligence of duty.

- An abuse of power of office.

8. On or about 01 October 1993 Mr. Mark Hone, a member of staff of the Law Society, prepared an affidavit which was false. It was deliberately meant to mislead the High Court, to which I had applied for leave, for judicial review of the decision of the Law Society, refusing to exempt me. In short, the conduct of the Law Society could only be described as:

- A breach of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers

Transfer Regulations 1990.

- Negligence of duty.

- An abuse of power of office.

9. On 10 November 1993 the Law Society again considered my application for exemption. At the time, I was entitled to be exempted by virtue of the fact that I had, practised law in the offices of English Solicitors for more than 2 years. In the second place, I had sent to the Law Society the Opinion of Counsel. It specifically requested the Law Society, to name, if any, specific requirements to be produced. No specific requirement was requested! In the third place, Counsel managed to produce the rules of Professional Conduct and Accounts which governed my legal practice in Uganda for over 25 years. Counsel specifically pointed out that the rules

were identical with those in England. In the circumstances, the Law Society was evidently guilty of:

- A breach of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers

- Transfer Regulations 1990.

- Negligence of duty.

- An abuse of power of office.

10. On 11 August 1994 the Law Society again reconsidered my application for exemption. This time, I had given them 2 more additional factors! First, I had by then practised law in the offices of solicitors for about 4 years. Second, I had found out through discovery, ordered by the Industrial Tribunal, that none of the exempted English Barristers had produced as much proof of knowledge in Solicitors' Accounts, as I did! Even then, I was still refused exemption. through fraudulent efforts, of Solicitor Anne Coles. In the circumstances the Law Society was guilty of:

- A breach of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers Transfer Regulations 1990.

- Negligence of duty.

- An abuse of power of office.

11. On 05 October 1994, when it was only 3 weeks for the Industrial Tribunal to hear my application for racial discrimination against the Law Society, the Law Society

admitted, for the first time, that its exemptions policy was contrary to the provision of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers Transfer Regulations. It further admitted that, as a result of its racially discriminatory guidelines, it had discriminated against me, on racial ground! The admission, in law, entitled me for judgement for:

- A breach of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers

Transfer Regulations 1990.

- Negligence of duty.

- An abuse of power of office.

12. On 11 May 1995 Professor Read of the University of London produced , on commission by the Law Society, a comparative study of the rules of accounts governing Uganda, Tanzania and England and Wales. In the first place, there never was any need at all to commission Professor Read to produce a report showing that the rules of legal practice in Uganda was identical to that in England and Wales! I had already sent those rules to the Law Society. And they knew that the two sets of rules, were identical. In the second place, I had sent to the Law Society, a photo copy of the conclusion, made by Professor Read, in his book, on the laws in East Africa. It stated that the rules of legal practice were identical! Whereas the Law Society had pretended not to see any similarity between the Uganda rules and the English rules of accounts, Professor Read pointed out that:

<u>In Uganda, the Advocaates Ordinance 1956 contain as</u>

Schedule the Advocates Accounts Rules and the Advocates Trust Accounts Rules; these reproduced almost verbatim the provision of the English Rules of 1945 which now appears in the Solicitors Accounts Rules 1991.

The Conduct of the Law Society in this respect was thus:

- A breach of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers

Transfer Regulations 1990.

- Negligence of duty.

- An abuse of power of office.

13. In November and in December 1995 two meetings took place to consider my application for exemption. I was still refused exemption on the ground that I had not supplied the required proof! It was thereafter that I was told to send a letter from a solicitor showing that I was convesant in the knowledge of Solicitors' Accounts. I sent the letter and was duly exempted. The fact that the required proof had continued to be concealed from me, with the result that I was not exempted during the November and December meetings is proof that:

- A breach of Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers

Transfer Regulations 1990.

- Negligence of duty.

- An abuse of power of office.

I estimated the damages that I suffered, as a result of the negligence, by the Law Society, to be at the rate of £5000.00 per month. In 1996, the total damages that I suffered was thus £275,000.00. And that was the sum of money that I claimed.

As was to be expected, with so many corrupt judges and lawyers around, the Law Society would never allow such a case to be heard on its merit. And so, as usual, they applied to the Court to have the case struck out on the ground that it shows no cause of action! As was to be expected, the application was made by the most corrupt solicitor of all, Robin Lewis! Master Forster heard it. The application claimed first, that my case against the Law Society, was a re-litigation of the dispute, between the parties, which had already heard and determined, by a court of competent jurisdiction!

The reader will remember, that at his summing up, of the case for the Law Society, before Chairman E R Donnelly, Counsel for the Law Society, Lord Lester, had asked that judgement be written in such a way, that it would assist the Law Society, in any future cases, that I was likely to bring against the Law Society! As was to be expected, Chairman Donnelly had tamely complied with that request. In order to assist the Law Society with its future cases, Chairman Donnelly, changed the order that she had made in the open court, with the consent of the parties! In court, she had ordered that I had "withdrawn", with the consent of the Law Society, my case for direct racial discrimination! Outside the court, she ordered that my

application for racial discrimination was "dismissed"!

The Law Society now relied on that order, which they had obtained by blackmail! It claimed, falsely, that the Industrial Tribunal had already heard my case, against the Law Society, for direct racial discrimination, and had dismissed it! It claimed that my case before the High Court, for a breach of statutory regulation, negligence, and abuse of power of a public office, was based on the same facts as my case for direct racial discrimination had been! Hence that I was asking for a re-litigation of the same cause of action, under different names!

The second ground raised by the Law Society, as a ground for asking that my case be struck out, was that a breach of statutory duty does not confer a private right of action. It contended that the only exception to the rule denying private action was where the statute itself, had specifically authorised a private right of action.

My threefold defences were as follows. First, that the ground of re-litigation, given by the Law Society, in its application to strike out my application, is known in law, as res judicata. It means the matter that has already been decided. The principle is that when a court of competent jurisdiction has finally adjudicated upon, a matter, it may not be reopened or challenged by the original parties. In order for the court to regard the matter as res judicata, four conditions must be fulfilled. In this case, three, of the 4 conditions were not fulfilled.

My second ground was that, although, on the face of it, the law denied me the right to bring a private action, yet, the legal interpretation of the law, known as precedents, allowed me to bring the action that I brought. I quoted similar precedents on which I relied.

The third defence, on which I relied, was that the law is does not permit a litigant to be:

"driven from the judgement seat" except where the cause of action is obviously bad and almost incontestably bad.

I pointed out that it was part and parcel of abuse of power by the Law Society, to try an action by affidavits, such as those filed in the case. The sole object of opting for affidavit trials, instead of oral testimony, was to deny me the opportunity, to cross-examine the Law Society culprits responsible for negligence and abuse of power!

The hearing before Master Forster turned out to be a bad joke! The Law Society had produced massive documents. Master Forster came into the court, as is the practice of Masters, without having read any of them! It was impossible, within the time allocated for hearing the application, for him to read any of them! He relied on submissions by the parties. He ignored my submission in its entirety! He accepted the submission of the Law Society in its entirety! He held that the case I brought was sub-judice! He also held that I had no right to bring a private action with regard to the breach of Regulation 6. He, accordingly, ordered that my case be struck out. Then, he awarded costs against me. But he was good

enough to recommend that his order for costs be not enforced.

Any other public body would have accepted such a recommendation, from the court. The Law Society, at first stated that it had accepted it. But later changed its mind!

RE-LITIGATION:

I lodged an appeal against the decision of Master Forster. On 04/06/97, my appeal came for hearing, before His Honour Judge Prosser Q.C. I dealt first, with the decision that my case was a re-litigation of the dispute between the parties. I held that the case before the court was never determined by the Industrial Tribunal. I pointed out that out of the four conditions, necessary for the dispute to be declared re-litigation, i.e. res judicata, only one of the conditions had been fulfilled. The 4 conditions are:

1. The dispute must be between the same parties. This condition was fulfilled. The dispute was between the Law Society and me.

2. The dispute must have been determined by a court of competent jurisdiction. This condition was not fulfilled. Although the Industrial Tribunal is a court of competent jurisdiction, with regard to cases of racial discrimination, it does not have the jurisdiction to determine the cases I had brought in the High Court i.e. it has no jurisdiction to determine cases for breaches of statutory duty, negligence and

abuse of power!

3. The cause of action must be the same. This condition was not fulfilled. The cause of action in the Industrial Tribunal was for racial discrimination. The causes of action in the High Court were for breach of statutory duty, negligence, and abuse of power.

4. The requirement of proof must be the same. This condition was also not fulfilled. The requirement of proof for racial discrimination was merely, less favourable treatment on grounds of racial origin or colour. The requirement of proof in cases for breaches of statutory duty, or for abuse of power or for negligence, had noting to do with racial origin or colour of the skin!

Thereafter, Counsel for the Law Society, admitted that I was right. The dispute was not res judicata! When that new Counsel for the Law Society had insisted, before the Master, that the dispute was res judicata, the Master agreed with him. Now the same Counsel, had changed his mind. He has now agreed that the dispute was not res judicata. The judge has also agreed with him. And, accidentally, with me!

RIGHT OF PRIVATE ACTION:

I then dealt with the second point about the law denying me the right to bring a private action for the damages that I suffered, as a result of the breaches of the law, by the Law

Society. I relied, at first, on similar precedents in which the courts permitted private actions to be brought and awarded damages to the parties whose statutory duties were breached.

Secondly, I relied on a manifest error of law. It was an error of law to contend that damages is not payable, where breaches of law have been intentional, systematic, malevolent, fraudulent and were intended to cause irreparable damage and had caused irreparable damage! To refuse a suit in the circumstances would be:

1. Contrary to Article 12 of the European Convention which entitles all to a fair remedy.

2. Contrary to Article 17 which prevents engagement in activities which destroy fundamental rights of others.

3. Contrary to the European Law Principle of Certainty or the English Law Principle of Legitimate Expectation. The English law provides that it is an abuse of discretionary power for a public body to exercise discretionary power in a way which confounds expectations resulting from its prior behaviour. A breach of legitimate expectation gives a private right for a suit.

4. Contrary to the European Law Principle of Proportionality, or the English Law Precedent of Reasonableness. In England, decision of public servants which are so outrageous in their defiance of logic or accepted moral standards give private right of action.

The Learned Posser Q.C. rejected that point. He held that as

long as the decisions complained of was made under Regulation 6, the fact that it was a breach of human right, a breach of legitimate expectation, or was unreasonable was immaterial!

A DUTY OWED IN TORT:

I then made submission on the decision of Master Forster, that, because the Law Society had made its decision, by virtue of Regulation 6,it followed that there could be no claim for liability under the law of tort! The decision appeared to me to be completely unreasonable. Its sum total was that, decisions made under statutory laws, automatically suspend the applicability of the law of tort!

It was clear from my pleading that although the decision was made under Regulation 6, yet they resulted into clear negligence under the law of tort. The law permitted such negligence to be causes of action regardless as to how they arose. The Law Society had, committed the following breaches of duty that they owed to me in the law of tort. And the law allowed me to sue them for it:

- The duty for a public servant to act fairly i.e. in accordance with the law of natural justice.

- His duty to abide by the precedents of uniformity or consistency.

- The duty not to violate my human rights etc.

- The duty not to conceal, legal requirements for exemption.

- The duty not to misinterpret the law because of some hidden agenda.

- The duty not to make a fraudulent affidavit to mislead the court.

- The duty not to neglect, fraudulently, evidence presented for exemption. And so on. And so forth.

The Judge rejected my submission on that point. He held that since my application for exemption had been considered under Regulation 6 it follows that no action can be brought under any other law. Only the action permitted by Regulation 6. And, that action was an application for judicial review.

MISFEASANCE:

The judge also ruled, with regard to my case for abuse of power, that I had failed to prove malice in the Industrial Tribunal!

I had pointed out to him, that in the Industrial Tribunal, the case was never heard on its merit! The question of proving malice therefore, could not arise. I also pointed out, and indeed, had pleaded the fact that, His Honour Judge Altman,

had made a definite finding that the actions of the Law Society towards me had been malicious! Further, I had pleaded several acts of malice:

1. Refusal to exempt me in accordance with the Law Society policy of 2 years legal practice in the offices of solicitors.

2. Refusal to exempt me in accordance with the Law Society practice of similar rules of legal practice.

3. Refusal to exempt me in spite of the recommendation by my supervising solicitors.

4. Fraudulent concealment of exemption requirement.

5. Ignoring conflict of law rules.

6. Refusal to admit that I had obtained more marks than that required for exemption.

7. Indefinite postponement of considering my application for admission. And so on.

Judge Prosser made himself wilfully blind to the evidence of malice by the Law Society. The question is,

Why have I, in spite of such wilful blindness, of his Honour Judge Prosser, to the malice of the Law Society, categorised him, amongst the just judges in the country?

It was not because of his just decision. His decision was not just. It was because of his just intention. His intention was

very just.

Although he ruled that I did not have a case in law, yet, after he had given his judgement, he said that he wanted to add a few things, off the record. He then made it clear that his sympathy was with me. First, he recommended that I should not be made to pay the cost that the law obliged him to order against me, after dismissing my appeal.

If he expected the Law Society to abide by his recommendation, then he did not know the malignant nature, of Solicitor Robin Lewis, who was acting as the solicitor for the Law Society.

Then he went on to show a rare dexterity, in not acting like other judges, who behaved as if they were the advocates for the Law Society. He opted to act like a judge. He maintained, as he had already ruled, that my complaint was well founded, in that the causes of action had not been determined before. It was not a re-litigation as Lord Lester and Robin Lewis had wanted it to appear! It was not, as the lawyers say, res judicata. However, my best interest, as he saw it, was that I should not fight the Law Society i.e. if I wanted, as I had said, to practise law as a solicitor.

I was aware of that. But I was still grateful to him to have been sufficiently concerned to say it. Clearly, it was not wise for me to oppose directly to the strong current of resentment from the Law Society. But reconciliation is not a one way affair. I tried it. I failed.

Judge Prosser then went out of his way to point out that it was

in my best interest to give the Law Society time. In his words:

Temper has flared. It needs time to cool down.

And it was in my best interest, to give the Law Society, time to cool down.

Such is the quality of the public servants we have in the Law Society of England and Wales!

I was, of course, furious at the decision. Having held that the causes of action were different, I could not see how my case could be struck off. And so, I prepared a notice of appeal. I paid the fees for lodging it in court. But, when I thought deeply about what he had said, I agreed with him that it was a good idea to give temper time to cool down. So, I never lodged the appeal.

The question that kept on nagging me, was the length of time required for temper to cool down. Several years had already passed. Temper had shown no sign of cooling down. However, it was probable that the judge was talking with some authority. If so, what would he consider a reasonable time for temper to cool down? I considered that perhaps a maximum of 4 months would be enough for the purpose. The problem is that, I was not growing any younger. The Thames does not flow backward. And the more the years roll forward, the less able I am to practice! With a combination of glaucoma, and leukaemia, I am of the opinion that by 2005, there would be no legal practice for me.

CHAPTER 23.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

THE MOST JUST JUDGES:

LORD DENNING

THE GENIUS OF LORD DENNING:

An American Philosopher, Ralph Aldo Emerson once said that when nature has work to be done, she creates a genius to do it. Nature had work to be done. There was a crying need for a systematic reform of our laws by judicial precedent. So, nature created a genius to do it. That genius was Lord Denning.

It was to that genius, Lord Denning, that I appealed to assist me in my dispute, with the Law Society. I made it clear in my appeal, that if, for any reason, he could not assist, he should just dump the bundle of documents, that I posted to him, in the waste paper basket. And that was what he did. He was, as usual very sweet about it. He apparently tried and concluded that persuading the Law Society, was out of the question. It

had to be a battle. And, so he wrote to me a letter in which he pleaded his age. He was then over 90 years of age. He pointed that out that his age no longer allowed him to start yet, another battle.

I agreed wholly with him. I was about 30 years younger than him at the time. But, I had already started to feel the burden of age.

Although Lord Denning did not try my case, I consider it right and proper to write about him, so that the reader would know, how the greatest judge of all judges, would have judged my case.

From 1957, when I became a law student, Lord Denning (Alfred Thompson, in short, Tom) OM PC former Master of the Rolls, who died on 05/3/99, has been my idol. I read quire a bit about him. I concluded that the seed, that was to lead to his greatness was sown, began to grow, and to flourish, at the beginning of the twenties when he was, for one year, a school teacher in Winchester.

That seed, that is, the attribute, that was to single him out as the greatest lawyer that ever lived, was not, as many have stated, his assiduity, his engaging manner, or his delightful conversation. It was his being a teacher. As a teacher he acquired the discipline for explaining to his pupils, with apparent ease and grace, any point at all. His secret was to explain the point in the simplest language possible, and, exhaustively.

DENNING THE LAW TEACHER

Thereafter, though he had ceased to be a teacher, and became a student of law, yet, Lord Denning still remained a teacher! Never a student! He was always a leader! Never a follower! When he ceased to be the teacher to pupils at Winchester, he became the teacher of law to litigants, jurors, lawyers, fellow judges and, through his judgements, to the world at large.

The law became his greatest concern. It filled his heart. Its study became, to him, a labour of love. And he studied it with deep penetration. So enamoured was he, of the subject, that whenever he sat down to talk, or write about it, the overflow was a lesson in law, in the way in which that aspect of the law, had never been taught before!

He called this gift of his, the Power of Exposition. He regarded legal reforms as the object of his life. He regarded his power of exposition, as the means for achieving that object. This is how he puts it:

"By expounding the law, you pave the way for reforming it. You must need point out its deficiencies - and to pave the way for remedying them".

Why was Lord Denning so concerned about the reform of law, as to devote his adult life on achieving it? In his own word: **"After all, every one should be concerned - seeing that the law affects the lives of all of us at some time or**

other".

So successful was Denning in his chosen object of life that without his pronouncement on any given legal topic, any lawyer, worthy of the name, always felt that there was something missing! The final lesson, in that piece of law, was yet to be given!

JUDICIAL BIAS

Take the point of law of judicial bias, which is central to my case against the Law Society! A person like Judge Mitchel, seems not to have the forgiest idea of what the law is! Had Lord Denning been the Master of the Rolls, he would have told Judge Mitchel, that it had nothing to do with personal bias which Mitchel mistook it to be! It was based on a conflict of interest situation. To repeat, briefly, Lord Denning's precedent on the issue, which I have already quoted, the precedent states:

"The court does not look at the mind of justice itself or at the mind of the chairman of the tribunal, or whoever it may be who sits in a judicial capacity. It does not look to see if there was a real likelihood that he would, or did, in fact favour one side at the expense of the other. The Court looks at the impression that would be given to other people. Even if he was impartial as could be, nevertheless, if the right minded-persons would think that, in the circumstances there was a real likelihood of bias on his

part, then he should not sit. And if he does so, then, his decision cannot stand..."

DENNING'S FIRST MISSION OF TEACHING THE LAW

Although he is famous, all over the world, as a legal reformer, yet, his greatest achievement is actually not in the realm of legal reform, as such, but in the sphere of giving lessons in law.

Of all the lawyers, he was, by far, the most accomplished artist, the most distinguished man of letters. He was a master of style. And he attached great importance to style. This is how he put it: **"You will see too, that style plays a great part - the style of writing, - the style of oratory - the style of giving judgement".**

His judgements were ever authoritative, not merely because of their original contributions to the developments of both the letters and spirit of the law, but also because of the memorable way they were presented. Reading his judgements was never an arduous task, but the greatest pleasure.

His mixture of style and tones, his figurative technique, his exact punctuation, his elaboration of the particulars of facts and the points of law that they raise; his technique of pointing out the absurdity of the views that he opposed, by striking comparisons and contrasts, as well as his rhetorical technique,

imbued his judgements with both lucidity and force.

A good example of how Lord Denning would have tried this case, is to be found in the case of **Sykes v. Director of Public Prosecutions [1962] A.C. 528**. It was an appeal from the decision of the Court of Criminal Appeal to the House of Lords, Lord Denning's judgement, which as usual, was a remarkable lesson in law, explained the offence of misprision of felony in a way crucial to my case. Lord Denning held, in the same way that Judge Altman held that I had a duty to report the crimes committed by Lord Lester and his Gang! The precedent, on the obligation to report a criminal offence committed has already been quoted above. But, since I was punished for obeying that law, there is need to repeat, briefly, his classical statement of the law:

"My Lords, it has always been an offence for the last 700 years or more, not always under the name, `misprision of felony`, but still an offence. Ever since the day of hue and cry, it has been the duty of a man, who knows that a felony has been committed, to report it to the proper authority so that steps can be taken to apprehend the felon and bring him to justice".

While still a practising barrister, Lord Denning himself realised that his statements of the law exhibited fascinating individuality and originality and were, a great lesson in law. He accordingly went all the way out, never to stultify any special views he held on any legal subject, but to express them, copiously and effectively.

DENNING'S SECOND MISSION OF REFORMING THE LAW>

To many people, Lord Denning's law reform was his magnus opus. And it is certainly true to say that no modern judge has set out, to the extent that Lord Denning did, to supply lawful remedies to the loopholes in the law. He was dedicated to ensuring that the society felt secured in the knowledge that the law covered, most of the contingencies, which call for legal remedies.

The England of Lord Denning, was not the England of Queen Victoria. Nor, for that matter, of King George VI. Drastic changes were taking place in all walks of life. Education was spreading fast. The public mind was approaching, as it never did before, its maturity. It could no longer be laid to sleep with the song about our having the best judicial procedure. Nor could it be amused by a rattle, about our laws being established on immutable principles! The changes that were taking place daily, in the state of public knowledge, called for corresponding changes in our judicial system. It would be most absurd to argue that while such revolutions were taking place, the judicial system ought to have remained unchanged

Naturally, the legislators could only effect fundamental changes, which called for the repeal of an existing law, and its replacement. But changes, which fell short of that, changes that called for the filling of loopholes in the existing law, had

to be effected by way of judicial interpretation. And that was what Lord Denning went all the way out, to effect.

As he saw it, the main problems with our law, was not its object. He had no quarrels with the objects of our law. The main problem was that the statement of the law fell short of saying what the objects of the law impel it to say. The reforms of Lord Denning were simply to remedy these manifest lacunae. And the remedy, that is, his reforms, consisted in spelling out the logical consequences of the objects of the law. It was as simple as that.

ABUSE OF POWER OF A PUBLIC OFFICE:

When the medicine no longer cured the disease, because the disease had developed some new strains, then, the spectrum of the medicine had to be broadened, to combat the new strains. In the same way, when new instances of abuses of the law have emerged, and they do fall within the objects of the law, but outside the statement of the law, then, it was necessary to re-state the law, without affecting its object, so as to bring the new abuses within the law.

The area of law in which Denning considered legal reforms most needed was in the field of abuse of power of a public office. And he dealt specifically with the kind of abuse of power that the Law Society, the Bar and the Judiciary have perpetrated against me. This is how he put it:

"The most important function of the law is to restrain the abuse of power by any of the holders of it - no matter whether they be the Government, the newspapers, the television, the trade unions, or the multi-national companies, or anyone else".

THE PRECEDENT OF FAIRNESS:

As seen from the examples given above, Lord Denning's definition of misprision of felony is so broad as to allow the offences committed by just any person, whether he be Lord Lester, or the Lord Chief Justice, to be reported.

In the same way, Lord Denning laid down the standard of judgement of what constitutes abuse of power of a public office. It is in his precedent of fairness. As quoted below, his definition of fairness is also so broad as to cover all aspects of misconduct by public servants.

As Lord Denning saw it, law is not amoral. It imposes on all public officials, including judges, general standards of conduct. The best known of them all, he called the standard of fairness. And that is my main accusation of the Law Society. They had abused the power of office by not abiding by the legal requirement of fairness. This is how Lord Denning M.R. states the Standard of Fairness:

"A public body must not misuse its power; and it is a misuse of power for it to act unfairly or unjustly towards a private citizen where there is no overriding public interest

to warrant it"

The legal requirement of fairness dictates that where any law has stopped short of spelling out the assumptions upon which it rests, or its necessary implications, then it is the duty of the courts, acting fairly i.e. in the interest of justice, to spell out those assumptions or those implications. And that is what Lord Denning did. His re-statements of the law, were, very properly, called reforms and very improperly, called revolutions. They were formal reforms, in that, although they had been implied in the objects of the law, yet, they had never been specifically stated. But, they were not revolutions, because they have always been incidental to the law and not entirely new.

It was to be expected, that those who attack abuse of power, as Denning did, and as I have done, must expect to be rewarded with conspiracies and victimisation.

CRITICS OF LORD DENNING'S REFORMS

Although Lord Denning embarked on his legal reforms with a disarming, pacific and conciliatory manner, yet, the language of those who disagreed with him amounted to scathing attacks against him. They accused him of deliberately ignoring the law! And of substituting his views in place of the law! They accused him of creating precedents that would make the law depend on the whims of judges!

Lord Chancellor Simonds claimed that Lord Denning reforms were "**a naked usurpation of the legislative function under the thin guise of interpretation**"

Simonds was accusing Lord Denning of trying to usurp the Chancellor's function! The conduct of Lord Chancellor Simonds, in that respect, recalls to mind the unparalleled cruelty of Mercury who, in Plautius, knocked down Sosia, for being so impudent, as to have the same name with him!

There are, indeed, many persons to whom reforms are loathful for being reforms! They fear the unknown because it is unknown! Lord Chancellor Simonds appeared to have been one of them. His legal opinion was clearly at variance with those of Lord Denning. Although rivalry was disclaimed, and hostilities denied, yet, the end result of the differences between the 2 legal giants was clear. One of the two, either Lord Denning, or Lord Chancellor Simonds, had to leave the House of Lords. It was Lord Denning who left it.

What has happened between the Law Society and me appear to be the history of Lord Denning and Lord Simonds repeating itself, albeit with a difference. It appears that there are some persons within the Law Society to whom reforms are loathful for being reforms! They fear the unknown because it is unknown! The Gang of Four appear to be amongst those staff. Their legal opinion was clearly at variance with mine. Although rivalry was disclaimed, and hostilities denied, yet, the end result of the differences between the 2 sets of legal giants was clear. To the Gang of 4 it became the question of either I remain outside the Law Society, or they get out of the

Law Society. So far, I have remained out! .

When he was kicked out of the House of Lords, Lord Denning sought to make a virtue of necessity. Like the fox who consoled himself that the grape that he failed to get, was sour anyway, Lord Denning said that it was, anyway, more difficult to effect reforms from the House of Lords. In the House of Lords, he had to win the support of 4 colleagues. In the Court of Appeal, he needed to win the support of only 2 colleagues!

This was a confession by Lord Denning, who was a judge for some 38 years (i.e. from 1944-1982)) that a number of his colleagues, had placed obstacles on his path to reform the laws. His being called a radical and a revolutionary had something to do with it.

Perhaps, like Denning, I also should begin to look for ways of making a virtue of necessity.

However, for the accuracy of history, it is necessary to point out that Lord Denning was never a radical. Never a revolutionary. The two objects of his mission were simply to teach and reform the law. It was never to break the law. It was always to fulfil the law.

None has ever said, and even now, none dares say:

"This is the new law, that Lord Denning has made"!

Nor could Lord Denning have tried to make any law! He knew that it was the function of Parliament, not of the courts,

to make laws.

Further, he knew that for a court to make law, and then to interpret it, would have amounted to an intolerable dictatorship. He loathed all forms of dictatorship. He loathed all forms of abuse of power of office.

When Lord Denning advocated that the House of Lords, in its judicial capacity, should take powers to itself, and should change the law when it needed changing, rather than wait for more leisurely parliamentary processes, he meant exactly what he stated, namely that:

When the statement of a given statute falls short of the requirement of the object of the statute, then, the House of Lords, in its judicial capacity, should take powers to itself, and should change the law in compliance with the object of the statute.

It would have been unreasonable to wait for the more leisurely parliamentary process, to change such laws.

Yet, Lord Chancellor Simonds, who championed orthodoxy, expressed his distaste for a:

"naked usurpation of the legislative functions under the thin disguise of interpretation"

CRITICS OF LORD DENNING'S CREDIBILITY

The most inexplicable of all the accusations, made against

Lord Denning, was that he did not practise what he preached. His critics claimed that although Lord Denning held that his sympathies lay with the underdogs, yet, in practice, he tended to support the "superdogs" against the underdogs! They allege that he sided with the employers, against the unions and with the Home Office, against the immigrants!

There is no doubt that Lord Denning was grievously hurt by these unfair criticisms.

Clearly, like any other person, Lord Denning must have had his own prejudices and bias. But, as a judge, he did not act upon them. He possessed the all-embracing sympathy that enabled him to be the impartial judge that he was.

Lord Denning had simply found himself in an embarrassing position in which I found myself. I had only respect for the Law Society. But when it abused its power of office, I had no alternative but to point out the abuse.

The fact that the sympathies of Lord Denning were with the underdogs, did not mean that he should be blind to the abuses of union law by some unions, or to the abuses of the immigration laws, by some immigrants.

To challenge his credibility merely on the basis of his pointing out what he saw to be abuses was cruel.

Perhaps it is fair to point out that the allegations on the basis of which the credibility of Lord Denning was being impugned, appeared to have been justified by time. His

criticisms of the unions ultimately culminated in the Margaret Thacher's laws against abuses of union powers. His criticisms of some immigrants ultimately ended in Jack Straw's laws for Fairer, Faster, and Firmer - a Modern Approach to Immigration and Asylum.

SUMMATION:

To sum up, I believe that the attacks launched against Lord Denning, while alive, will die away. They will be seen for what they have always been: errors of judgement. Critics who quibble that Lord Denning ought not to have found fault with the underdogs, with whom he sympathised, or that he ought not to have reformed certain aspects of certain laws, because the main law had not been either amended or repealed, deserve from us, no censure. Their punishment, lie in their being who they are!

No doubt that both, as a lawyer and as a judge, Lord Denning must have had his weaknesses. But, I confess that I have looked for them, but did not find them.

I believe that even his worst critics would admit that the name of Lord Denning is justifiably associated, in the minds of his generation, much more than the name of any other lawyer or judge, past or present, with legal justice, at its best.

Those who agree with him, and those who disagree with him, will continue to agree that his judgements, remain the authoritative lessons in law and the classical examples of legal

reforms by the judiciary.

I believe that the approbation of the nation to whom his lessons in law, and his reforms of the laws have conferred great benefits, will confer on his memory, the affection it deserves.

His death has brought to an end, the search for the model for the future judge. He has become the model for the judges of the future.

CHAPTER 24.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

IN CONCLUSION:

PEOPLE, PEOPLE EVERYWHERE:

It all reminds me of the Ancient Mariner:

Water, water everywhere,

Not a drop, to drink.

Except that, in this case, it was:

People, people everywhere,

Not a soul, to help.

I do not remember how many times I found myself again and again, the question:

Can none of these people, in authority, intervene, when I am still alive, to find out the truth, about what is happening? Are they waiting for me to die, in order to allow the Law Society to publish a whitewashed version of what took place?

THE PRESS:

I have always believed that gross acts of abuse of power in the United Kingdom, ultimately find their way in some paper. I used to believe in the truth of what Humbert Wolfe said that:

"You cannot hope to bribe or twist, thank God! the British journalist".

Much water appears to have flowed under the bridge since then. The day of the daredevil reporters, who refused to cover up abuses of power from any quarters, appear to be over!

My appeals after appeals to the press, to publish the abuse of power by both, the Law Society and the judiciary, have fallen on deaf ears.

From my experience of some 8 years, the press in Britain is no longer as free as it used to be. Old order indeed changes. It has yielded place to new. Most of the legal advisers to our national papers are solicitors. Unfortunately, many of them appear to be more concerned about the costs of libel suits than about the truth of the libel! The unwritten rule appears to be that in determining what to print:

- Likely libel cost comes first.

- Truth follows!

Further, a few of those legal advisers tend to work as the agent of the Law Society. The result is that the world is denied a chance, to read the abuses of power, by the Law Society! Had there been a free press, my grievances would have had redressed within a month or two. Without it, the grievances have taken 10 years! No hope of a settlement is in sight!

The Voice, which claims to be a "Black" paper, invariably squeals loudest, once a "White" paper has had the courage to publish a case of racial discrimination. It cannot, on its own, set the ball rolling. When the issue of belling the cat is muted, it is the first to turn its tail and run!

Its reporter, Mr. Henry Butcher, prepared what he regarded as a front page story in my case. He took my picture in gown and wig to publish with the article. His boss then talked to the Law Society. The article was dropped. Apparently, the Law Society threatened a libel suit!

The same thing happened to the **New Nation**. A dynamic lady reporter had worked day in, and day out, to prepare the article. She was completely convinced of the injustice meted unto me. She also took several of my pictures to be published with the article. Again, the Law Society intervened. Again, the story was dropped! Again, the lady reporter, like Henry Butcher of the Voice, left the newspaper.

Private Eye was actually the very first paper to show much interest in the story. Clearly, it was also discouraged by the threats of the Law Society!

In fact, the threat of the Law Society was always false! The **West Africa** magazine published the story! The Law Society dare not sue! Indeed, their first main object was to avoid publishing the truth. Their second main object was to avoid judicial investigation by the incorruptible British jury. So, the question of their being the cause of publishing their own crimes, and bringing about their own trial by the jury, could never have arisen!

It was unfortunate that the **West Africa** is a magazine, with mainly foreign readership.

My conclusion, from the failure by the press, to give voice to the atrocious injustice that has taken place in this country, is that the Law Society, is literally above the paper. The papers are expected, and invariably report misconduct of ministers. But they hardly report proved heinous offences committed by the Law Society officials!

The reason is easy to understand. The newspaper officials,

responsible for permitting reports of legal matters to be published, are, as stated above, mainly solicitors.

HUMAN RIGHTS BODIES:

Indeed, even my appeals to persons and organisations, whose objects are to assist the victims of injustice, have also been futile! The main cause of the unwillingness to help, is the fear of the immense influence that the Law Society wields!

After such an experience, it is difficult to believe the commitment of some of these bodies to human rights!

At the beginning of the dispute, I applied to the Human Rights bodies to assist me prosecute my complaint in courts. After 6 years of futile court actions, I applied to them to assist me settle the dispute from outside the court.

It was a painful dilemma to decide to give up the court! I had to choose, between evil and evil. On the one hand, the persecution meted to me, by the Law Society, forced me to sue my persecutors in court.

On the other hand, most of the judges who heard my cases, were so corrupt, that it was, invariably, a foregone conclusion, that justice was neither going to be done, nor to be seen as done! The choice was whether to suffer the injustice of the Law Society persecutors by itself, or to suffer both, the injustice of the Law Society persecutors, and the injustice of

corrupt judgements!

At the end of it all, I decided to suffer the evil of the Law Society persecutors only. Not the evil of the corrupt judgements. It dawned on me, that by suing my persecutors, I suffered both evils.

And so, I decided to appeal to human rights bodies to entreat the Law Society to fulfil their undertaking i.e. their undertaking to consider my application for admission as a solicitor.

COMMISSION FOR RACIAL EQUALITY:

The main responsibility for the implementation of the Race Relations Act 1976 lies in the hands of the Commission for Racial Equality. It is known by its initials, as CRE. In accordance with the law, I made a formal application to CRE for its assistance in my complaint of racial discrimination by the Law Society. In law, CRE was under a duty to assist, provided two conditions were fulfilled:

First, that the case raised issues of principle. So, I pointed out the issue of principle that the case raised, namely that a public body, such as the Law Society, which gives licences to persons to practice a given profession, is not allowed to discriminate in conferring such an authorisation. I also referred to the case of Orphanus v. Queen Mary College ([1985] 2 Aii E.R. 233) in which the court held that the decision of the College to charge overseas students fees, at an

increased rate, was discriminatory on racial grounds. Mr. Rees. of the CRE appeared to have accepted the validity of the point of principle raised.

Second, the case also raised the issue of unreasonableness of the respective parties. It was unreasonable to expect me, a nonentity, with no experience, at the time, in cases of racial discrimination, to take on the Law Society, which, had hired lawyers who could only be described as giants in their profession, and as wolves in sheep's clothing! They had hired Robin Lewis of Bindman & Partners, solicitors, and Lord Lester Q.C. of Counsel. Both the solicitor and counsel had the reputation for supporting the victims of human rights violation! And that was the very reason why they were hired i.e. to betray their public image. They were hired to join the hounds against the prey!

When I went to hold a conference with the CRE official, I found out that he had not read my application! When I explained to him what the case was all about, he appeared to admit that the Law Society had discriminated against me. He did not say that the discrimination was racial in nature. On the contrary, he kept on repeating:

Very complicated case! Very complicated case!

In law, his admission of the case being complicated was a justification for assisting me! To him, however, it appears that CRE must never deal with complicated cases! Especially where a powerful public body was concerned! I was not therefore surprised when he subsequently wrote to me a letter,

refusing to give me any assistance!

Then an incredibly strange thing happened! It reveals the treacherous nature of the CRE. It proves beyond all reasonable doubt, that where a powerful public body is concerned, CRE would rather betray the victim of racial discrimination, rather than fight the powerful body!

Before my case for racial discrimination came for hearing in the Industrial Tribunal, I wrote to the CRE and asked them whether they were then, prepared to assist me, in view of the admission by the Law Society, that they had indirectly discriminated against me.

The CRE promptly replied stating that it was prepared to assist me on the issue of the indirect racial discrimination, which the Law Society had admitted! They were not prepared to assist me, on the issue of direct racial discrimination, which the Law Society had not admitted!

When I told the Law Society Solicitor, Robin Lewis, over the telephone, about the decision of the CRE, he laughed loud and clear! It was the first and only time that I ever heard him laugh!

Then he exclaimed:

"Assist you in what the Law Society has already admitted! How! What for!"

LIBERTY:(THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR CIVIL LIBERTY)

The Commission for Racial Equality would not help me. The Legal Aid Board had also conspired with the Law Society to deny me legal aid. The only alternative left was Liberty. So, I wrote to them. I entreated them to help me in an attempt to settle, from out of court, the dispute between the Law Society and me.

They were sympathetic. But, they would not assist. They recommended that I seek the assistance of firms of solicitors, dealing with legal aid work. They enclosed in their letter, a long list of solicitors, who did legal aid work. I found myself in a vicious circle! I had already tried an out of court settlement through solicitors. It had failed. I told Liberty that Legal Aid would not give me the fund to settle the dispute in court. Now Liberty was asking me to obtain fund for settling the dispute from the Legal Aid Board!

LORD AVEBURY:

I also applied to Lord Avebury in his capacity as the noble Lord dealing with human rights issue in the House of Lords. He replied that he was afraid that he could not assist me. He suggested that I approach my Member of Parliament.

MY MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT: HARRIET HERMAN M.P.

It is insupportable that those who have opted to represent us in Parliament, because our voices are too feeble to be heard by those in authorities, should, when the occasions for our representation arise, betray their trust, with such a flimsy sophistic argument, that deceives none!

Hon. Harriet Herman M.P. did just that. A short chronology of events may help:

On 04/03/1996, the Law Society wrote to me a letter giving a firm promise to consider my application for admission as a solicitor, as soon as their complaint against me was determined by the Bar Council. Their undertaking reads:

"I will arrange for your application for admission to be considered further by the Transfer Casework Committee of the Society as soon as the General Council of the Bar has finished consideration of Mrs. Coles complaint".

The General Council of the Bar finished consideration of Mrs. Coles complaint in 1996. Yet the undertaking was not fulfilled.

The Disciplinary Tribunal of the Inns of Court then finished consideration of the same complaint in 1997. Again the

undertaking was not fulfilled.

The High Court then completed consideration of my appeal in the matter in 1998. Again, the undertaking was not fulfilled! All my applications that it be fulfilled were simply ignored!

A year later in 1999, I entreated my Member of Parliament, Honourable Harriet Herman, to entreat the Law Society to fulfil their undertaking. She did not give a reply to my letter! On 12/02/99, I went to see her in her surgery. She promised to write to me on the subject. She did not do so! It was history repeating itself. I had formerly waited for 2 years to get an answer to my letter. It never came. I was thus obliged to telephone her offices and leave messages. On 29/03/99 she replied declining to assist. Her excuse was:

"Your complaint refers to the Law Society and therefore legal matter. I am unable to take this matter any further"!

Lesser persons than her, had appealed to the Law Society on my behalf. They were an official in Bromley Race Equality Council and a Liberal Democrat Southwark Councillor, Alfred Langley. The Law Society ignored their appeal for months. But when I showed their appeal to Mr. Justice Maurice Kay, the Law Society promptly answered their appeals giving further undertaking to consider my application for admission. These undertakings were again never fulfilled! Bromley Race Council wrote a reminder. The reply was that the undertaking would be fulfilled. It has never been fulfilled!

I again approached my Member of Parliament, informing her that had the undertakings that the Law Society given to to my

Councillor and to the Race Council, been given to her, it would not have been lightly breached!. I therefore appealed to her to come to my rescue. Again she declined to do so! Her letter of 14/07/99 stated:

"As you know I am unable to make any intervention in your cause as it is a legal matter"

The question is:

If a Member of Parliament does not have the jurisdiction, to ask a public official, to abide by the promise given to a constituent, on the ground that the subject matter is legal, what then, is not a legal matter?

Harriet Herman went to Parliament to make laws and to air our grievances. She did not go their to represent us in illegal matters!

My conclusion was that, Harriet Herman made a wrong choice of occupation. Her very terms and conditions of being a Member of Parliament were to represent her constituents. In refusing to lift a finger to help her constituent in distress, was an abdication of her duty as a Member of Parliament. Not much was asked of her. All that was asked of her was to write a one sentence letter to the Law Society stating:

In accordance with your promise, made on 04/03/1996, to arrange for the application for admission of my constituent, to be considered further by the Transfer Casework Committee, please let me know the date for

consideration.

Her failure to assist in the circumstances amounts to abdication of her duty as a Member of Parliament.

I could of course, see her predicament. She had found herself in the horn of a dilemma. On the one hand, Herman, the Solicitor, had to fulfil the demands of her professional body. On the other hand, Herman, the Member of Parliament, has to try to assist her constituent. In this particular case, she held that she could not assist her constituent without incurring the wrath of her professional bosses. She thus held that it was in her personal interest, not to disappoint her professional bosses. But she could disappoint her constituent, with absolute immunity. And so, she opted to do what was in her personal interest, but against her duty as a Member of Parliament! She betrayed her duty to her constituent!

It is unfair that a Member of Parliament, who is wide-awake to her own personal interests, should have turned blind eyes to her official duty!

BARRISTER MARSHALL RICE.

In order to avoid a debate on its violations of my human rights, the Law Society never gave a single answer to the articles that I wrote against them, on my internet magazine: Anti-Sleaze Magazine.

It was thus left to a Mr. Marshall Rice, so-called barrister, to try to defend, with bogus ferocity, both, the Law Society and the corrupt judges, whom I attacked. As a result of his defences, an internet addict, held that Marshall Rice had earned for himself the name of:

The Running Dog of the Most Corrupt.

Throughout his defences, Marshall Rice appear to maintain that a critical discernment is uncalled for amongst Black English Barristers applying to become English Solicitors! All that is expected of us, is to accept, without challenges, any decisions made by the Law Society! He has never to denied any specific charges that I made against the Law Society! Nor against individual judges! Instead, of denying the facts upon which my charges were based, he came out with such irrelevant defences, such as, for instance, that I once criticised the British rule in Uganda! Or that it was a good thing for the Law Society to refuse me admission, because I had become the Law Society staunchest critic!

My reply to such defences was that he was barking at the wrong tree! I left Uganda in 1950, when I was a schoolboy. The word independence was not known to us then! In fact, there was not even a single political party in the country! I returned to Uganda in 1960 when Britain had already agreed, in principle, to give Uganda independence. She was as good as her word. She gave Uganda independence in 1962. Nor was I a Member of the British Parliament that granted Uganda its independence!

The problem with Rice is that, he ignores the obvious. According to Regulation 6 of the Qualified Lawyers Transfer Regulation, I am described as an English Barrister. No English Barrister worthy of the name, will allow his human rights to be invaded. Nor, for that matter, would he allow the fundamental rights of others to be invaded if he can help it. Charity, however, begins at home. If you cannot fight for your right, you cannot fight for the right of others. And the dispute between the Law Society and myself has been on human rights. It has been about nothing else.

The authorities I have quoted in this book, in support of my human rights war, are almost wholly British. Why? Because I am part and parcel of those authorities.

What Rice does not know, is that during the colonial period in Uganda, we were, though Africans by birth and tradition, and proud of it, also brought up to be well versed, perhaps much more well versed than Rice, in what makes England ticks i.e. the cream of English thoughts. What is said in this book would have been said by Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Bertrand Russell, Martin Luther and even by Churchill!

However, the fact that Rice could stoop to tell such lies to prevent me from being admitted as a solicitor, and to ensure my continued discrimination by a variety of public offices, speaks for itself.

No wonder that Rice himself has been severely criticised. It has been pointed out that a person like him, who supported the

most corrupt officials, for punishing me, for fighting against violations of my human rights, was not fit to be called a barrister.

Throughout his scribbling, the imagination of Marshall Rice, appears so inflamed by racism, that he conceived of complaints against racism, in the way Judas Iscariot conceived of the teaching of Jesus Christ!

A friend of mine, who read the manuscript of this book, was startled by both what the Law Society had done to me, as well as by the failure of the human rights bodies to come to my assistance. He said:

"A white man cannot write this book".

I asked:

"Why".

He replied:

"Because no white man could be treated, the way you have been treated. And, no White man could be completely deserted, the way you have been deserted"!

There is certainly much truth that my colour made me an ideal whipping boy. It ensured that I could be persecuted with some impunity. The persecutors appeared to have been assured that there was no risk, of any official within the system, squealing!

PASSING THE BUCK:

However, what I found to be incredible was that while human rights continued to be violated, human rights bodies continued to make excuses for taking no action! At best, they merely passed the buck to some other shoulders!

It is inconceivable that the bodies responsible for promotion of human rights, should be deaf to entreaties to them, to assist a person whose human rights has been and continued to be mercilessly violated! Yet, that is exactly what has happened! None of those bodies dare refuse outright to assist me. But each and everyone of them resorted to passing the buck onto some other shoulders!

I am sorry to have to point out that such excuses make them perhaps, the most deadly enemies of liberty! Had they not been there, we would have been obliged to fight for our own liberty. Because of their presence, we wasted months and months making futile applications for their assistance! Like the instruments of darkness, having successfully tempted us to rely on them, they betrayed us.

Their tomfoolery, their resorts to such mummery and mumbo jumbo excuses have discredited them. And what is more, it has tended to create the impression that their secret object is to protect the interests of the oppressors, while paying lip services to the interests of the oppressed!

My opinion about human rights bodies has somersaulted. I

invariably found myself asking:

Are they really human rights bodies or are they Judas Iscariot, who betrays you with a kiss!

CHAPTER 25.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

IN CONCLUSION:
CONCLUSION:

My prayer to you, the reader of this application is that you bear in mind the following 4 points:

1. THE AUTHOR: Forget about me, the author of the book. Whether an author is good or bad, is immaterial. His cause is material. His cause may, as in this case, be the cause of all good people.

2. RELIEF: This is not an application for a revolution. Nor for a revenge. Only for a remedy. The only remedy I ask for, is that necessary investigations be carried out, to verify whether my accusations are true or false.

3. PUNISHMENT: If the accusations are found to be false, I ask to be punished for making a false report. If true, I ask that the corrupt officials and judges be punished for perverting the course of justice, and for perjury etc.

4. TRUTH: I believe that it is better to live like a God, for one

day, than like a rat, for a hundred years. To tell the truth, in spite of its most devastating consequences, is to live like a God. Hence, the labour for truth, that has gone into the production of this book did, so to speak, transform, while it lasted, my human life, into the life of some sort of a supernatural being.

CHAPTER 26.

THE MOST CORRUPT BRITISH JUDGES by Dr. A Adoko

IN CONCLUSION:

VERSES INSPIRED BY ABUSES OF POWER:

01. STREAM OF JUDICIAL INJUSTICE:

Like a kiss of a cobra,

The swift stream of judicial injustice,

Has touched our hearts,

And has broken our lives:

When we are alone,

It stings our hearts;

When we are in a crowd

It makes us moody;

When we are in the dark

It conjures a dreadful phantom;

And when we are asleep

It haunts our dream.

Like a double-edged sword,

The swift stream of judicial injustice

Cuts left and right:

It cuts the heart, and makes us sad

And cuts the brain, and makes us mad.

Like the criterion of Adolf Hitler,

The swift stream of judicial injustice,

Is based on favouritism and bias,

Nepotism and racism.

02. GIVE ME STRENGTH:

Many a sigh have I heaved,

Many a tear have I shed,

Many a door have I knocked,

Many a prayer have I said,

In a vain attempt, to free myself,

From official bondage!

Days sped by, then weeks,

And months and years!

I gave myself for lost!

I gave up all hopes

Of legal practice!

Shivers would pass,

Through my heart;

A thrill of fear,

Would disturb my sleep;

Thunder of rage,

Would explode within me.

But, my life was seldom astir:

My spirit flagged!

I groaned in despair!

I uttered no word!

I sang no song!

I prayed and prayed:

"Give me strength, my God:

Give me strength, never to give in!

When my path, is closed

When my voyage, draws to a close

When my life, threatens to ebb out

Give me strength, my God

Give me strength, never to give in!

03. TWIN BROTHERS:

The riotous excess of racism

Must not set apart,

The twin brothers:

The White and the Black.

Let the strain of their unity,

Mingle in our bosom,

To flood the world,

With the song

Of human brotherhood.

Let our curse of racism

Become the tempest

That sweeps away,

The harsh and the dissonant,

In our harmony.

Let the enemy of race

Have no hiding place;

And let the breeze of racism,

Be a passing phenomenon.

04. OUR DAILY PRAYER:

Almighty God

To whom man is human:

Neither White, nor Black,

Neither native, nor alien. Thou, who has made strangers Our brothers,

Who has given us a home,

Over the seas.

Give us now yourself

Through eternal love

That fills us with Thy sweetness

For ever, and ever

Amen.

05. THE LAW SOCIETY:

Ten livelong years have passed

My legal practice remain undone!

The blossom has not opened!

My heart sighs with agony!

My eyes dim with tears!

I keep gazing at the door

For their mail to arrive,

But their mail arrives not!

So, my heart aches with anguish

And sadness falls upon me.

I have become a solitary wayfarer

On the Legal Practise Street!

Will the mail surely come?

Will the waiting surely end?

Will the blossoms surely open?

Will my joy take wings with songs?

And will my heart ever throb to the melody!

06. OFFICIAL ARROGANCE:

I had come to beg

For a licence to work

When my eyes fell upon you

And thy glance fell upon me.

My hopes rose high

And my heart sang and said:

"My unemployed days are over!"

And thy lips echoed my words:

"Your unemployment days are over".

Then all of a sudden

Thy lips changed tune and sang:

"Not now! Not ever! Never!"

The memory of your arrogance

Clings to my heart

And enfolds it in bitterness.

07 LASHES OF MALICE:

Let not the title, Noble Lord

That precedes Anthony Lester,

Hamper his human feeling.

There is nothing noble

In the lashes of malice!

The same stream of blood

That runs through Lester's vein

Runs through my vein.

The same reason

That flows through Lester's brain

Flows through my brain!

The same life

That ebbs through Lester's body

Ebbs through my body!

The same death

That threatens my life,

Threatens to wait

for Lester life!

Is it not beyond reason

That Lester should hurt

What is mine

Which is also his!

08. ENDLESS CASCADES:

Unless I express my sorrow,

It'll lie hidden in my heart

And threaten to break out,

Through the lid of my heart

Making me a nervous wreck!

I'm caught and broken

In the whirl of fearful hatred

That rushes on and on:

Never looks behind,

Never slows down,

Never marks time!

Months come, and years go

But there is no deliverance

From the nightmares

Of the official hatred!

Again and again,

My heart pours its sorrow

In endless cascades!

09. ENDLESS SORROW:

The world vibrates with pageantry

But the gloomy sorrow

Casts its cloud deep

In the inner recesses

Of my soul!

The pageantry that has

Overspread the world

Gave birth, in my heart,

To a song, so poignant

That it made me weep!

It's taken hold of me!

It has smashed my hope,

And dashed down, my dream!

My life had been blessed:

It had enjoyed its festivity:

I had conversed with the highest;

I had dined with the lowest.

My life is now cursed:

Will the icy hands of death,

Wrap themselves around me

And end the gloomy sorrow?

When the time comes

To deliver your warrant of Death

I crave your indulgence:

I beg for no delay!

My heart heaves with agony

My eyes fill with tears!

My sorrow is endless!

My soul knows no rest!

Drunk with worries,

I cry in confusion:

"Your delay has made me heir

To endless sorrow"!

10. THE EYES OF SORROW:

What benefit have I derived?

From the overflowing cup

Of sorrow,

That they have poured

For me to drink?

Necessity answers and says:

Through the eyes of sorrow

You have seen your Creator!

Through the eyes of sorrow

You have felt His sweetness!

Though the eyes of sorrow

You've enjoyed, eternal harmony!

His Signet of Sorrow

Thrills with disguised blessing

Those that it touches.

11. A CONSUMMATION:

Ten years of legal practice

Were stolen from me!

My times for practice are over!

It was not a sweet parting:

Its bitter memory remains!

With raped laws,

My doors for legal practice were shut!

With malice aforethought,

My practice was barred!

They robbed me of my dream!

Such was their fury!

Like the embrace of lovers,

Weariness clings around me!

Like glowing charcoal,

My eyes glowed red with worries!

Like some watchers of a bank,

Sleepless nights awaited me!

Why did they single me out

To publish their crimes?

Why have they made me

The reporter of their crimes?

There are many ways

Of skinning a cat!

There are many ways

Of reaching heaven!

Publishing abuse of power

Is a consummation,

Penalised on earth,

But rewarded in heaven.

12. THE SQUIRRELS:

The fight is over

And, what a fight it was!

One man against the world!

The hawks against the wren!

The rhinos against the rabbit!

Throngs of them, jostle together!

They fear the world, of the truth!

They block their ears, from the truth!

They close their eyes, from its justice!

With all their opiate of power

They are still filled with fear

Of the world of the truth!

They tremble and cling to one another

They dare not face the music!

Their number arouses in them,

Neither courage, nor hope!

The timorous squirrels

Must fear the light

That reveals their theft!

I am the light;

They're the squirrels.

13. THE CHEAT:

They have cheated me of many things!

But, they haven't cheated me of all things!

I have what they cannot cheat:

Truth, justice and conscience!

The all embracing God

Has shed His blessings

Upon the victim of the cheat;

Not upon the cheat themselves!

14. THE PANG OF SORROW:

The pang of sorrow

Struck in silence

And spread throughout

My mortal body!

Tears of sorrow

Was all I had;

Tears of sorrow

Was all I gave

To you, my Creator.

Day and night

Tears flowed down my cheeks

Day and night,

My heart melted into a yearning

To be with you, my Creator!

Surprise, surprise,

The tears have woven

A chain of communication

Between Heaven and me!

15. ETERNAL SLEEP

I knew that the day would come

When I will depart this earth

And I kept waiting for Death

To take what was mine

But pledged to him.

But he did not come

To take my soul

That is pledged to him!

Days came and nights went,

Years bloomed and faded,

My yearning eyes watched and waited

And the grief of my heart

Poured itself in lyric.

And now Death has knocked

At the door of my life

And asked for what is mine

But betrothed to him!

I welcomed him and said to him:

It was mine, but it's yours now:

Take it. Take it. Take it.

But let the curtain

Of my eyes close;

Let the birds continue to sing;

And the sun, to shine

And the night, to fall

So that the world,

Grudges me not,

The eternal sleep

That is now mine!

16. THE EYES UP THERE

There are eyes up there,

The eyes of those close to me:

My father's and mother's

My brothers' and sisters'.

They beg me not to resist

The Summons of Death

And why should I resist

The Summons of Death?

What have I left undone

Which I ought to have done?

I'm passed the experience:

Of laughing and weeping,

Of eating and drinking,

Of happiness and anger.

I hunt for the horizon:

I hunt for territories unexplored:

I long to submerge myself

In a bottomless abyss

Of deathlessness!

And so, thou hovering Death,

There is no cause for alarm!

Let, my dear breath,

Vanish, like a candle,

Blown out, by a puff of wind!

17. I WISH I COULD FLY AWAY:

I wish I could fly away

From this human tabernacle

To those heavenly angels

Who run errands

Between Heaven and Earth!

I yearn to learn about heaven:

Is there Socrates to converse with?

Are there Plato and Aristotle?

Are there Shakespeare and Tennyson?

Are there Denning and Emerson?

And Lincoln and Kennedy?

And Gandhi and Nkrumah?

Is there honey to enjoy?

And sweet fruit juices too?

Are there flowers to admire?

And Daddy and Mummy to love?

And will they tell me a secret,

Why the Gang of Four,

Were created to haunt the earth

By harbouring hatred and malice

And by finding faults in all things!

Will they set me free?

From the iron fetters

Of the Gang of Four!

And will they imbue me,

With a stream of pleasure,

A breeze of contentment,

A bloom of happiness!

18. THE PILOTS OF INJUSTICE:

I tried to cross the Sea of Justice,

With corrupt judges as my pilots,

The crossing could not be done:

Those Pilots conspired to defeat justice:

Chief Justice, Lord Bingham,

The Double-crosser of Justice.

Mr. Justice Morrison,

The Murderer of Justice.

Mr. Justice Michael Wright,

The Desecrator of justice.

And Mr. Justice Potts,

Nicknamed, Judicial Bias.

Mr. Justice Maurice Kay,

The Wolf in Sheep's clothing.

His Honour Judge Mitchel,

The Hound of the Bar.

Chairman Miss Donnelly,

The Stooge of Stooges.

Chairman David Booth,

The Most Corrupt Judge.

The Anonymous Bar Judges,

Notorious, as Cowardly Judges.

Lord Lester of Herne Hill,

Nicknamed, the Chameleon.

Solicitor Robin Lewis,

The Blackmailer of Judges.

Director John Rendall,

The Traitor of the Law Society.

And Solicitor Anne Coles,

The Fraudster of the Law Society.

BOOK INDEX

This site was updated on 09 April 2002 at 10.30hrs

PRINTED & PUBLISHED

BY

LONDON TRUTH PUBLISHERS

DR. A ADOKO

10 SOANE HOUSE

ROLAND WAY

LONDON SE17 2JT

ISBN: 1 871694 05 1